THE NEW STUDENT

Vol. 8. No. 4 JANUARY, 1929 Price, 15 Cents

Unrest in the Negro Colleges

By JOHN P. DAVIS

Man Can Know

By GORHAM B. MUNSON

The Colleges of Bolshevik Russia

By NUCIA PERLMUTTER

Contents

THE MONTH 2

NOTES ON FREEDOM
By Suzanne LaFollette 4

THE COLLEGES OF BOLSHEVIK RUSSIA
By Nucia Perlmutter 7

MAN CAN KNOW
By Gorham B. Munson 9

DARTMOUTH IN WAR AND PEACE
By Leonard W. Doob 9

UNREST IN THE NEGRO COLLEGES
By John P. Davis 13

ARKANSAS PLAYS THE CLOWN
By Paul Page Faris 15

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE WORLD 16

BOOKS
REVIEWER'S COPY
By Newton Arvin 19

A VALIANT CRUSADER
By Sylvia Feningston 21

IN THE LIVING TISSUE
By Norman Studer 21

Nucia Perlmutter was born in St. Petersburg, Russia, February 20, 1899. She was graduated from Mariinsky Gymnasium of that city in 1916, and came to the United States after the March Revolution. She received her M. A. from Clark University in 1924, and is now research assistant at the International Institute, Teachers College, Columbia University.

John P. Davis, B. A., Bates College, M. A., Harvard University, was formerly assistant editor of *The Crisis*; then director of publicity at Fisk University; and is now studying law at Harvard University.

Sylvia Feningston writes us that she has been dividing her time recently "between free lancing both as an actress and a writer, doing articles and book reviews and writing a play."

Leonard W. Doob is a senior at Dartmouth College. His article is reprinted from *The Tomahawk*, an undergraduate publication at Dartmouth.

Paul Page Faris is at present an instructor in American and English Literature at Hendrix College. He has contributed several other articles to *The New Student*, during the past few years.

The New Student does not necessarily endorse all the articles appearing under the signature of an author and accepts responsibility for editorial opinions only.

Editor, Norman Studer. *Business Manager*, Mildred Meyer. *Contributing Editors*, Suzanne La Follette, Newton Arvin, Douglas P. Haskell, Sol Abramson, Kenneth Porter, Sol Auerbach, Paul Porter. Published by *The New Student*, 2929 Broadway, New York, monthly during the college year. Subscription for one year $1.00; Foreign Countries, $1.50. Single copies, 15 cents. Entered as second-class matter April 30, 1922, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

The Month

ONE of the most interesting bits of news that we have gleaned from this month's papers is that of the excavations on the site of the ancient Olynthus, once a rich and powerful Greek city-state lying on the Macedonian plain not far from the Toronaic Gulf, and head of the Chalcidic League which precipitated the Peloponnesian War and the ruin of Greece. According to Dr. David Moore Robinson, who conducted the excavations, the discoveries will enforce a revision of hitherto accepted ideas about Greek civilization of the fourth and fifth centuries B. C. It has long been assumed that the houses even of the upper-class Greeks of that period were comparatively mean, and that their love of splendor was expressed in their public buildings. But at Olynthus, destroyed by Philip of Macedon in 348 B. C., and never rebuilt, the excavators found that the wealthier inhabitants had lived in a degree of luxury which has always been associated with the late Roman period. Houses were unearthed that had as many as ten rooms to a floor, and were furnished with such conveniences as bathtubs, which have been thought to be of Roman origin. The excavators also discovered vases of exquisite workmanship in the red and black coloring with which we are familiar from the Greek collections of our museums, as well as fine busts in terra cotta and marble.

There is something dramatic in the discovery of this ancient city some twenty-three hundred years after its destruction; its scattered objects showing in what terror and haste its population had left their homes and shops. No doubt the owners of these busts and vases, these elegantly appointed houses, left their city to pass from the condition of free men into that of slaves; for that was the way of the ancient world. The inhabitants of the city-states of the Mediterranean whose incessant commercial rivalries precipitated frequent wars, knew that if their city were captured their fate was almost certain to be either slavery or death. The modern victor is less savage if not less greedy than the ancient; perhaps because the destruction of a defeated nation offers a rather more difficult problem than that of a defeated city. Besides, we have learned a thing or two about methods of enslaving populations. Nowadays the preferred method is through indemnities. In the ancient world the method of loot and destruction was that most generally adopted—the tactics of the bear rather than those of the bee-keepers; and long before the final disappearance of Greek civilization we find the poets lamenting lost cities. Many of these cities still lie, no doubt, as Olynthus lay for centuries, under two or three yards of earth, potential sources of knowledge of the life and customs of a vanished world.

* * *

The rivalries which are destroying our own civilization are not different from those which ruined ancient civilizations. Methods of warfare may differ; the causes remain

THE WORKERS EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE
Conducts
TWO COURSES of LECTURES
by HARRY WATON

I. **A COURSE ON UNIVERSAL LITERATURE**—Destiny speaks through literature as it functions through history. This course will teach how to interpret literature and to enjoy its beauties.
FRIDAYS 8 to 10 P. M. SINGLE LECTURE 50 CENTS

II. **A COURSE ON UNIVERSAL HISTORY**—In this course will be shown how destiny functions through history in one, continuous, rational, predetermined process.
SUNDAYS 3 to 5 P. M. SINGLE LECTURE 50 CENTS

Every lecture a classic by itself.

MANHATTAN TRADE SCHOOL
(Lecture Room) LEXINGTON AVE., Cor. 22nd St.

constant—the rivalries of privileged groups in the exploitation of the earth's resources and its peoples. *Vide* the present dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay over the matter of a boundary. According to the labor press, which scents a capitalist plot in every dispute, the Standard Oil Company, which has invested heavily in Bolivian oil lands, is back of the Bolivian attempt to push its boundary into the long-disputed region of the Chaco, toward the river Paraguay, leading into the Parana and thence to the Rio de la Plata. Bolivia needs the trade-outlet to the Atlantic that these rivers would afford; and she needs it, one would say, quite irrespective of the Standard Oil's desire to have an outlet for its pipe-lines, for which, one might think, it could probably negotiate an amicable agreement with the Paraguayan Government. Whatever the inside story of the case may be, it has been near precipitating war, and may yet do so. A clash between Paraguayan and Bolivian troops on the border provoked the usual patriotic hysteria and loud demands for war in both countries. Troops were mobilized, Red Cross units were organized, patriotic societies passed the usual resolutions. Indeed, the descriptions in the press of the busy preparations in both countries were reminiscent of nothing so much as Rabelais' masterly account of the preparations at Corinth.

The dispute created a delicate situation for the Council of the League of Nations. How to admonish the disputants, both members of the League, without giving offense to the United States: this was the problem before the Council. It is not surprising, under the circumstances, that the resolution finally transmitted by the Council to the Governments of Bolivia and Paraguay was couched in language quite different from that of the peremptory order sent three years ago to the Governments of Greece and Bulgaria, to stop fighting and withdraw their troops well within their respective frontiers. In its message to Bolivia and Paraguay, the Council contented itself with expressing the conviction that the two countries, as League members, would have recourse to peaceful means to settle their difficulties. Meanwhile the Gondra Commission had offered to mediate, and so had the International Conference of American States on Conciliation, in session at Washington. Bolivia made polite excuses to the Gondra Commission; but both the Bolivian and Paraguayan Governments notified the League that they were ready to submit their disagreement to the Conference at Washington. Whether or not the Conference will be able to reach a settlement satisfactory to the two countries of a dispute which has been going on for a half-century remains to be seen.

While the Conference thus busies itself with a practical problem in conciliation, the American Senate, if it does what a large number of American citizens' organizations are demanding, will be ratifying the Kellogg multilateral pact which is euphuistically termed "the anti-war treaty," or "the treaty renouncing war." A great many organizations that would be two hundred per cent American if this country went into any war for any reason are enlisted, with a few others, in support of the Kellogg treaty; and a large number of those citizens who may be expected to maintain that the next war is "different." If these organizations and individuals are sincere in their desire for peace, it is hard to see why they are so loudly in favor of a treaty which, with the French and English constructions accepted by the American Government, embodies, as Dr. Edwin M. Borchard has pointed out, the first legal recognition of war as an instrument of international policy. In any case, the treaty is worth as much as the paper it is written on, and no more. Governments, as John Jay remarked, will go to war whenever there is anything to be had by it; and when there is something to be had by war, no international agreement to renounce it will ever be worth a jot more than inconvenient international agreements ever are in war-time; that is to say, not a jot more than nothing. We remarked last month that the United States Government did not appear to be pinning much faith to the Kellogg treaties. The cruisers for which Mr. Coolidge has asked will share, it appears, the attention of the Senate with the treaties after the holiday recess. This is appropriate; it shows how much more realistic governments are than the peoples they hoodwink with conferences on conciliation and disarmament that cost no one anything except the taxpayers. It is questionable whether cruisers are any longer very effective weapons for naval warfare; but if it came to a clash with, let us say, British imperialism, they would at least be more substantial and effective than treaties.

* * *

In Russia the only Government that has ever taken a serious step toward abolishing war, by abolishing the privileged group whose interest is served by war, has resolved upon an experiment which may determine whether or not itself shall be abolished. According to the news-dispatches from Moscow, the Soviet Congress recently decided to carry out a plan to communize agricultural production. It is proposed to increase the crop-total from thirty to thirty-five per cent between 1929 and 1934 through "an enormous extension of State farms, State-aided 'collectivities' (groups of small peasant units for co-operative working), communal farms and State-aided 'metayage,' here called 'contractation.'" This is logical, of course. If Russia is to be a communist country then certainly its basic industry will have to be communized. It cannot continue indefinitely with a communized industry and a "capitalistic" agriculture. Communized industry in Russia, however, has not yet paid its own way, although it may do so when certain necessary large capital expenditures have been paid for. Whether communized agriculture can be made profitable can be proved only by experiment. Russia is much more an agricultural than an industrial country; therefore it may be that in the question whether or not communized agriculture can be made profitable will lie the crucial test of the communist system.

One dislikes to envisage any failure of the Russian experiment. It is encouraging in these days of increasing unemployment among laborers and large incomes among capitalists and monopolists, to know that there is at least one country in the world where the producer is considered more important than profits. Everyone is poor in Russia; but at least everyone is not poor because a monopolistic economic system cuts him off from the opportunity to make a comfortable living. There are none of the contrasts there between extremes of wealth and poverty that add bitterness to the sorrows of the poor in other countries. In the Western world, the competitors in an overcrowded labor-market are not only suffering from the dearth of employment due to industrial depression; they are suffering also from the constant diminution of opportunity that follows the ever increasing development of machine-processes. We have lately had two striking examples in this country of the hardships that this development entails for the worker. The introduction of the vitaphone into motion-picture theaters has thrown hundreds of musicians out of employment; and now the invention of a machine which will enable one operator in a central news-office to operate any number of linotype machines in distant newspaper-offices threatens to displace a large number of linotype-operators. Labor-saving devices would be as beneficial as they are marvelous if laborers were in a position to profit by them. As it is, they are injurious to the laborer and profitable only to the employer whom they enable to dispense with his services.

Notes on Freedom

IV. *Freedom and the Individual*

By SUZANNE LA FOLLETTE

AT the close of my last article, I remarked that I would deal more fully this month with the relation of economic freedom to the life of the individual. When I wrote that article I did not know that immediately following it in the same issue of *The New Student* would appear an article graphically illustrating the direct relation of economic bondage to the life of the individual: that on the conditions of labor in the Packard factory, by Mr. Robert L. Cruden. If I had known it, I would have referred my readers to Mr. Cruden's article as an object lesson in the frightful effect of that overcrowding of the labor-market which results from expropriation. The Packard company, in the position of the capitalist who profits fortuitously by the unnatural competition among workers, exploits in the hardest manual labor the helpless men who have no choice between starvation and acceptance of its terms and its conditions of work. It is significant of the desperation which this frightful competition induces, that these men, according to Mr. Cruden, will endure the agonizing pain which attends certain processes of the work, and any amount of blackguarding from their foremen, but that they meet discharge with a bitter and appalling anger. No better object-lesson could be cited in the effect of the wage-slavery that has supplanted chattel-slavery and serfdom. For the conditions of labor in the Packard factory are not exceptional; they are typical rather of the abject helplessness of those human beings, who, literally starved off the land by the extortionate demands of the landlord, are forced to compete with one another in the industrial labor-market for the doubtful privilege of mere existence—doubtful for the reason that their effort can have but one end: that they may continue to be exploited until death or age or incapacity puts them out of the running.

Organization of laborers into unions can do something to ameliorate the effects of this competition; but at best it is only a weapon of defense, and at the very time when it is most needed, in periods of industrial depression when men are desperately in need of work, it is likely to be rendered useless by the enforced willingness of workers to accept starvation-wages and the most unfavorable conditions of labor. In the skilled trades, it stands a fair chance of effectiveness, because skilled workers are comparatively few, and therefore fairly easy to organize. But the task of creating and maintaining any effective organization among the great mass of unskilled workers who are precisely those that suffer most directly and acutely from the overcrowding of the labor-market, is a task which offers almost insurmountable difficulties. Even assuming that this task might one day be accomplished, and that the resultant unions were strong enough to hold out against the insistent demands of employers for the open shop; even then, in any crisis precipitated by disputes between employers and the unions, the latter would be at a tactical disadvantage, since the employer is usually far better able than the worker to hold out through a long strike or lockout. Finally, and above all, even the most effective labor-union can do nothing to create opportunities for the workers; it can only confer on those workers who have jobs the negative benefit of protection against the worst effects of their dependence upon the will of their employers.

Nor will all the protective legislation in the world ever create opportunity where there is none. I have already remarked upon the absurdity of expecting a government which represents the exploiting interest to enforce effectively any law directed against that interest. Because government is by its nature opposed to the worker's interest, the attempts of reformers to safeguard that interest through legislation entail a maximum of vigilance and effort to achieve a minimum of good. The reformer is forever fighting a losing battle; as it is in the nature of the situation that he must. Even assuming that protective laws could be made entirely effective they would not, I repeat, provide work for those who needed it. The worker would still be obliged to depend upon the exploiting interest for his opportunity to work—which is of course to say, for his opportunity to live.

The ultimate effect of expropriation at all times and in all places is this reduction of the vast majority to slavery, in order that a small privileged class may live in idleness by their labor. However much freedom men and women may enjoy in theory, their freedom will be little more than theoretical so long as in fact they are subject to the will of those upon whom they are dependent for the opportunity to get their living.

I make no apology for thus repeating a point which I stressed in my last article; for this point is crucial, and therefore cannot be too often stated or too emphatically stressed. If the men and women who work in factories, mines and sweat-shops for long hours at tasks often extremely dangerous or painful or exhausting; if these men and women had the alternative ever present to them of tilling the soil for themselves, unburdened by the demands of any landord for tribute, the whole industrial situation would be speedily reversed; and instead of workers seeking employers we should find employers seeking workers, and paying them a wage determined not by competition for the opportunity to work, but by the

amount they could earn by laboring the earth for themselves.

The effects of this freedom would ramify throughout the social order; indeed it is not overstating to say that there is hardly a human relationship that would not be profoundly affected by it. Only those sentimentalists, probably, who believe that God ordained involuntary poverty in order that the poor might cultivate the virtue of patience and the rich that of charity, regard it as either natural or desirable. All thinking people are aware that it breeds ignorance, imbecility, disease and crime. Freedom would revolutionize the condition of that great majority whose lack of opportunity to support themselves decently and bring up their children under healthful conditions relegates them to the "lower classes" of our present social order. It would free them from their enforced preoccupation with material things—the problems of food, shelter and clothing, which would not be problems at all in any civilized society where there was even an approximation to economic justice. It would emancipate them from the indecent overcrowding which is the chronic condition of the poor in those cities which expropriation has swelled to enormous size; and overcrowding which breeds unspeakable degeneracy and crime and an appalling amount of disease. There would be no more undernourished children in the slums of cities or among peons on the land, growing up into enervated or imbecile men and women; for there would be no slums and no peonage. There would be no prematurely old children, wise in the ways of a harsh and squalid environment, growing up to live by their wits in defiance of organized society. If all the earth's resources could be made free of access tomorrow, the decentralization of our congested urban populations would have begun by the day after; and before long its results would be evident in a great shrinkage in the size of cities, as the land re-absorbed vast numbers whom monopolistic ownership now excludes from access to it. What is equally important, those workers who preferred to remain in industry would have an ever present alternative to industrial employment which would enable them to resist any unreasonable demands of their employers. Thus the labor-problem would be settled by the unfettered working of the law of supply and demand, without any need of mediation from labor-unions or reformers.

The change would of course benefit all classes of workers, whether manual or intellectual; for every human being who must earn his living by his own efforts, unsecured by any share in the ownership of land or industry, is in greater or less degree subject to the operation of economic injustice. The highest paid intellectual worker, if he loses his position, may find himself facing want, quite the same as an unskilled manual worker. Nor are intellectual workers, it need hardly be said, less subject than manual laborers to the competition which results from the overcrowding of the labor-market, or any more immune to that paternalistic interest of their employers in their morals and opinions, of which I spoke in my last article. As for those people who merely own, and depend for their living upon the labor of others, they are likely, if they lose their ownership, to be in the worst plight of all; for if they have never been obliged to work they are likely not to know how to work. This is why dispossessed aristocrats always have so hard a time adjusting themselves to the world of toil; and it is perhaps the reason also why rich people, in general, have the reputation of holding on to their money much more tenaciously than those who earn what they spend. Economic justice would really emancipate all classes in society from the omnipresent fear of want, by producing a condition where want, save under extraordinary conditions induced by natural calamities such as earthquakes, floods, or droughts, would be as rare as it now is frequent.

If this were all that might be expected from economic freedom, one might question whether it was worth any great effort to achieve. It is desirable, of course, that no one should know want; and yet the prospect of universal material well-being is in itself no more animating than is the spectacle of material well-being, for example among the middle classes of the United States. It is above all because economic freedom would make clear the way to other kinds of freedom that one wishes to see it prevail. It is highly desirable that no human being shall be forced to compromise with his conscience for the sake of securing his livelihood. If economic opportunity were freely available, no one would find himself under any external compulsion to adapt either his opinions or his expression of them to suit the interest of an employer; for no one can keep another from thinking and speaking as he will who holds no coercive power over him. People would still, of course, be obliged to risk the tyranny of public opinion; but with the "withering away" of the State the worst danger from this source would be removed. For public opinion is molded to a degree probably unsuspected by most people, through control by the privileged group over almost all avenues of information. With this control removed, public opinion, no longer misdirected toward the maintenance of a vested interest in the established order, would become more enlightened and tolerant.

The moral code, too, would undergo profound alteration; for there is no rule of human conduct which reflects changing economic conditions more quickly than this. An excellent illustration of this point is the revolutionary adaptation of the moral code that is even now resulting from the emergence of women into the world of wage-earners. I have remarked elsewhere that where a moral precept is no longer enforced by social or economic sanctions, its observance ceases to be a matter of worldly self-interest or expedience, and becomes a matter of personal taste. Many aspects of human conduct which are now regarded as falling under the purview of morals would be placed under that of manners by a more enlightened

public opinion—aspects, for example, such as personal habits, or sexual relations. The individual, freed from the tyranny of the moral code, would then be able to direct his conduct not with reference to what might be thought of him by other people—and especially by those holding economic power over him—but by what he wished to think of himself. And responsibility to oneself is the weightiest responsibility there is; for oneself is a judge from whose judgment there is no possible way of escape.

Economic freedom would thus not only mean emancipation from material need; it would ensure individual freedom to outgrow those superstitions and taboos which are perpetuated among a great majority of people by their bondage to ignorance and want. It would at the same time ensure the leisure to grow. It would not free people from the need to labor; on the contrary, indeed; but it would free them from the obligation to support idlers through their labor, and thus it would ensure not only the right to work but also the right to devote a large share of their time to amusement or study or a change of work. With the enormous saving of labor made possible through the machine, the redistribution of wealth which economic freedom would bring about would secure a large amount of leisure for everyone in return for a very small expenditure of time and energy in gainful toil.

Economic freedom, in sum, would more than anything else enable the breaking of the social mold which hampers the growth of all individuals, whatever their position in the social order. It is difficult to realize how pervasive and corrupting are the effects of the control of the social organization by a privileged class. We have seen that the instrument of this control is the political State. When one remembers that the political State assumes absolute power over the lives and property of individuals and stands ready at the first opportunity to cancel or render nugatory any concessions to freedom that have been wrung from it, one can begin to gauge the extent of its power to hamper individual growth. When one remembers too that it enforces a fundamental injustice, and does so, through its control of education, not only with the acquiescence of its victims but with their actual support, one begins to have some idea of the way in which it corrupts the minds of its subjects. In a political democracy, moreover, the fact that one's right to enjoy privilege is limited only by one's opportunities to get possession of it, has a further corrupting effect. This theoretical right to share in the fruits of exploitation is rather generally confounded with equality of economic opportunity, to which it is of course diametrically opposed. It is not surprising, therefore, that many of the citizens of a political democracy enjoy the illusion of freedom, and participate enthusiastically in that nationalism which has supplanted the outmoded dogma of the divine right of kings. The theory of the divine inspiration of constitutions has proved a remarkably effective modern substitute for the decayed prestige of kingship. The victims and beneficiaries of the "greatest government on earth" if one except a few malcontents and "dissentients afflicted with the malady of thought," are alike ready to rush to the defense of the constitution, and they are alike ready, paradoxically, to acquiesce in official disregard of its safeguards of individual liberty on the pretext that liberty is dangerous to public safety. Fear, like politics, makes strange bedfellows.

One would be going too far, perhaps, who envisaged utopian results from the attainment of economic freedom. It would certainly not mean the disappearance of injustice; so long as there are human relationships, so long will there be fruitful occasions of injustice between man and man. But it would mean the disappearance of institutional injustice—legalized injustice, enforced against the mass of mankind for the benefit of a privileged class. It would not necessarily produce universal enlightenment; but it would remove the cause of involuntary ignorance, which is involuntary poverty, and thus open the way to enlightenment for all those who wished to seek it. Certainly the least one can claim for it is that it would make real all those concessions to freedom that have been won only to be made ineffectual through the power of institutional injustice. But to say this is to say a great deal; for if people now enjoyed in fact that degree of freedom which is theirs in theory, autonomy would be no longer a thing to be desired and struggled for, but a thing to be accepted or rejected according to the nature and inclination of the individual.

I am aware that in these articles I have chosen to discuss a most unpopular subject; a subject which most people regard with apprehension, indifference, cynicism, or discouragement. I discussed the fearful person rather fully in my second article. The indifferent person is likely to be the one who enjoys a pleasing illusion of freedom; the cynic is the person who regards any discussion of freedom as utopian nonsense, having been brought to the sage conclusion that it is neither possible nor desirable, by the failure of its counterfeit, political democracy. The discouraged person takes an attitude of resignation to the injustice of life in this world: like a woman worker in a factory where labor was exploited with extreme brutality, who said to an investigator, "God is good to me; he gives me great patience." But there may be some value in an unpopular discussion. Patience will not last forever; nor will indifference or cynicism; and even fear may be overcome by desperation. The self-preserving instinct in mankind is slow to act; God gives men rather too much patience, one is inclined to think. But it is bound to act at last; one can depend upon it; and if any discussion of injustice can play even an infinitesimal part in arousing that instinct and directing it in the way of real freedom, then it cannot justly be considered either futile or untimely.

The Colleges of Bolshevik Russia

By NUCIA PERLMUTTER

I. INTRODUCTION

Universities Under the Old Regime. On the eve of the Revolution Russia had ten universities, one in each of the principal cities of the country. In addition there were some twenty-four higher professional schools of university rank, and a number of professional schools of somewhat lower standing. These latter institutions were also located for the most part in the large population centers.

The Russian universities were organized on the German pattern. Usually they consisted of four faculties: the historico-philological, the phys co-mathematical, the juridical, and the medical. In each of the first three faculties the course was four years in length, and candidates wishing to matriculate were required to present diplomas of graduation from an eight-year *gymnasium*.

Admission to higher institutions was largely limited by definite percentage regulations to members of the favored social classes, adherents of the Greek Church, and persons of Russian birth. This was a part of the Russianizing policy of the tsarist government.

Yet in spite of these regulations the overwhelming majority of university students were sons and daughters of the intelligentsia and petty bourgeoisie. Moreover the students of the old university were proverbially poor. About sixty per cent of them eked out a meager existence by tutoring. Although some were aided by moderate fellowships, the pauperism of university students was a recognized social evil of Russian life.

The traditions of the old Russian universities were those of devotion to science and academic freedom. Higher schools were independent institutions and enjoyed a large degree of autonomy. Work in them was of a high grade, but was carried on with little relation to the existing social order and with almost no regard for the economic needs of the country. The attitude of the students toward the government was that of antagonism.

II. THE REVOLUTION AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Change in Purpose. Immediately following the fall of the imperial government important changes were inaugurated. The Provisional Government set up by the March Revolution granted complete autonomy to all higher schools. It also abolished the regulations which discriminated against certain creeds, classes and nationalities.

Radical reforms in higher education did not begin, however, until after the October Revolution when the entire educational system was reorganized from top to bottom. New aims were then formulated and the universities were assigned a very definite role in the task of creating the new social order. In their purposes they were made to reflect the economic and class policy of the Soviet government. Chief among them is that of preparing qualified specialists and convinced Marxians, ready to guard the revolution and eager to participate in the building of a socialistic society. Naturally, since higher institutions in the Soviet Union must serve the interests of the ruling classes, the autonomy which permitted universities to function as independent organizations was abandoned. Likewise there is no place for academic freedom in the Soviet system of higher education: Communists do not separate science from politics.

The Growth of the Number of Higher Institutions. During the period immediately following the October Revolution the number of higher institutions increased at a fabulous rate. The years from 1918 to 1920 witnessed these schools springing up everywhere in response to local initiative. These were years of the greatest faith in and enthusiasm for the Revolution. Encouraged by the unprecedented attitude of the new government toward higher education for the masses, the Russian people had a vision of dotting the whole country with universities. Higher schools appeared spontaneously in the most remote corners of the country. Provincial communities vied with one another in establishing higher schools and by 1921 there were 160 such institutions scattered throughout the vast territory of Russia. But these were the trying years of Civil War and military intervention and the progress of educational reform was everywhere retarded.

With the end of the Civil War in 1920 the old as well as the new higher schools were flooded by a stream of young men and women just returned from the front. Actual experience proved, however, that these persons were not prepared for university work. The new student body was consequently short-lived. Although the records continued to show a large enrollment, great numbers of students had long since terminated their academic connections and had gone into the industries. Many of those who did remain greatly hampered the work of the universities because of inadequate preparation. The State therefore found itself confronted with two grave problems. On the one hand, the network of higher schools far exceeded the material resources of the country; and, on the other hand, the large number of ill-prepared students created an abnormal situation. Accordingly in 1922 on the initiative of the Commissariat of Education a special Commission of the Soviet of Peoples Commissars was created for the purpose of reorganizing the system of higher education. As a result of the work of the Commission, the number of institutions was reduced to ninety-nine; all the rest of the newly created schools were closed.

In 1923 the first attempt was made to work out a coherent plan of higher education. The Chief Division of Professional Education made a number of recommendations to the State Planning Commission, and the latter set to work to determine the needs of the State for specialists during the next five years. But it was not until the following year of 1924, after the aims of the Soviet economic structure had been well-defined, that the work of reorganization was actually begun. The chief problems faced in this reorganization were the reduction of the number of higher schools, the revision of the number of faculties, and the selection of a new proletarian student body. In their work the Soviet authorities were guided by two essential considerations, namely, the need of each branch of public economy for qualified specialists and the budgetary resources of the country for the next five years. As a result of this program of reorganization only seventy-nine higher institutions remained in 1924.

The next step was to relieve the universities of undesirable students. The so-called cleansing of the higher institutions occurred on May 15, 1924, and aroused severe criticism. Every seventh student in each institution was expelled. In carrying out the letter of the law grave injustices were done to members of the formerly favored classes, since they as well as the poorly prepared students were the object of the cleansing process. At this time approximately 18,000 students were dismissed. By the

end of 1925 the number of higher institutions was still further reduced to seventy-one with a total estimated enrollment of 103,235. Of these students 67.6 per cent were men and 32.4 per cent women. In their social composition 25.3 per cent were workers and their children, 25.3 per cent peasants and their children, and 49.4 per cent sons and daughters of former intelligentsia, petty bourgeoisie and others. But because of the general leveling down of classes during the last ten years, this 49.4 per cent, as a matter of fact, is also proletarian to the extent that it represents Soviet clerks and various employees. One can safely say, therefore, that the present composition of higher schools is proletarian throughout.

Administration of Higher Education. Co-ordination between the needs of Soviet society and the work of the higher institutions is realized by means of an appropriate form of administration. To this end universities invite local organs of the Soviet government, representatives from interested industries, and members of professional unions to participate in their work. The supreme control and supervision of all higher education is in the hands of the Department of Professional Education which is one of the eight divisions of the People's Commissariat of Education. The Commissariat is the court of final appeal in all matters pertaining to both the organization and the teaching personnel of a particular university.

For purposes of immediate control and guidance of the academic work and the economic life of the institution, every school has a Board of Administration. This board is made up of three or five persons selected by the Commissariat of Education from candidates proposed by the institution. Every university also has its Council which is composed of the Board of Administration, of the deans of all the faculties, of representatives from the professional unions, and delegates from the teaching staff and student body. The Council and the presidium of the faculty decide questions pertaining to the institution as a whole. Matters pertaining to separate subjects or a group of related disciplines are decided by subject commissions, composed of the corresponding teaching personnel and of delegates from the students in the proportion of one student to three teachers. This proportion is deliberately maintained in the belief that the students should influence but not guide the policies of the institution.

Every higher institution is divided into faculties, the number of which is determined by the People's Commissariat of Education in the light of local conditions. In this way duplication of agencies and wasteful competition among institutions are eliminated. And to avoid overproduction of specialists in any given field, a five-year plan, worked out on the basis of a careful study of the needs of society, so limits the enrollment in each department that only the required number of specialists will be graduated yearly.

Admission. The decree of August 6, 1918, announced that every person, regardless of class or sex, on reaching the age of 16 years is eligible to enroll in any higher school without presentation of diploma or certificate of graduation from any school. All tuition fees were also abolished. The purpose of this decree was to open wide the doors of higher schools to the masses. The proletarianization of higher schools, however, was a very slow process and for a long time the social composition of higher schools did not change. Those persons from the street and factory who tried to avail themselves of the opportunity were very soon eliminated because of inadequate preparation. Evidently other measures were necessary, if the working classes were to be brought into the universities.

The next step was the organization of schools specially designed to prepare workers for the universities. The first school of this kind appeared in 1919. And at present every higher institution is equipped with a workers' preparatory school or workers' faculty, as it is termed. According to the statistics for the year 1926-27 there were 109 such faculties in the Soviet Union with a total estimated enrollment of 45,702. The workers' faculty is a four-year school and enrolls workers and peasants who have a preparation approximately equivalent to that of a primary school. The prevailing method of teaching is the group method. The program of studies approximates that of a secondary school. The students are drawn almost altogether from the workers and peasants. Three-quarters of them are members of the Communist party. Although the institution is a temporary measure to meet a particular situation, some educational authorities in Russia predict that it will be required for at least fifteen years more.

Admission to higher schools at present is by examination only. All persons desiring to enroll, regardless of whether they have completed a secondary school or not, must pass an entrance examination which covers the program of a secondary school. The rigor with which this examination is administered depends largely upon the ratio of applicants to vacancies. Yet on the whole a high standard is maintained. In the selection of candidates the first consideration is academic qualification and the second is class affiliation.

The original Soviet decree abolishing tuition fees has also been revised. This factor has been reintroduced into the higher schools. The material condition of every student is carefully investigated and he pays according to his means. Most students, however, pay no tuition charges. Furthermore about 40 per cent of students in teachers' colleges and 30 per cent of university students receive small stipends. While the number of these stipends is considerable, the amount of each is very limited. For the year 1926-27 the government was able to provide 48,027 stipends for students in higher schools and 24,675 for students in workers' faculties. The amount of each stipend was 25 rubles ($12.50) a month in the large cities and 20 rubles ($10) in the smaller provincial centers.

Curriculum. Since the aim of the Soviet State is to prepare not mere specialists, but builders of the new regime; and since "a mere specialist, foreign to the worker in his psychology, is to be tolerated only until he can be replaced by the specialist who has blood ties with the toilers," a substantial program of political and social studies is introduced into every department or faculty of the university. This program is designed to give the student a general idea of Soviet society, to acquaint him with the theory of Marx, and to make him familiar with the whole revolutionary movement. The development of a Marxian point of view begins as a matter of fact in the primary school and continues to the highest level of the educational system. The minimum of social science which is imposed on all students regardless of their major field of interest embraces the following three courses:

a. Historic Materialism. The philosophy of dialectic materialism and the Marxian theory of history. One hour a week for one year.

b. Capitalism and the Proletarian Revolution. The characteristics and contradictions of capitalism; the class struggle in a capitalistic society; imperialism and the crash of capitalism; proletarian revolution and dictatorship; social democracy and its trends; and communism. Two hours a week for one year.

c. The Political Structure and Social Problems of Soviet Russia. The October upheaval and its causes; the constitution of the U. S. S. R.; the domestic and inter-

national policies of the U. S. S. R.; and domestic and international problems. One hour a week for a year.

Methods of Teaching. There is a strong tendency in Russia today to change the methods of teaching in higher schools just as completely as they have been changed in the lower schools. The new student is ill-fitted to the role of passive follower of lectures and demands a more active form of teaching. In meeting this demand the present government took a great step forward when it brought practical work in production into the training program. In pre-revolutionary times the student himself was forced to make provision for summer field work or practical experience in industry. At present summer work of a pertinent character is provided as a part of the university course. Industries are compelled to employ two per cent of their workers from the student class. And in the summer of 1924 sixteen thousand five hundred students were thus distributed in various enterprises for purposes of practical training. However, the attempt to eliminate the lecture method entirely has not proved successful as yet because of inadequate equipment and laboratory facilities. A large portion of the instruction in the universities of Russia at present still follows the lecture method.

Student Life. One naturally wonders whether student life is as interesting now as it was in the pre-revolutionary Russia when universities were centers of liberal ideas and political agitation. With the adoption on the part of the government of the policy of wholehearted support of higher education the antagonistic attitude of the students has disappeared. The high ideal of serving the whole of humanity which the Soviet State perpetually keeps in the foreground cannot fail to arouse young men and women. As a result the students of the new Russia are probably more idealistic than ever were their predecessors under the old regime. The life of the university student today is very strenuous. In the first place, his prescribed academic program is heavy. Seven hours a day is the average time devoted to lectures and laboratory work. But in addition to this practically every student feels a civic duty to perform some socially useful work, such as lecturing to groups of workers and participating in various clubs, reading circles, or dramatic societies. Furthermore, student self-government and student participation in the work of academic administration make serious demands on his energies. There are committees on attendance, on scholarship, and on sanitation. All of these activities require time. And if we remember that most students, even those who receive stipends, must seek some sort of employment for self-support, we arrive at a picture of the Russian student as a very active and busy person.

Standards. Standards of work in Russian universities have always been high. That they should have been lowered during the period of revolution and reorganization is only natural. The proletarianization of the higher schools was consciously done at the expense of standards and the Russian leaders were fully aware of the price which they were paying. However, the government today is taking active steps to raise the standards to the pre-revolutionary level; and in some instances the claim is advanced that these standards are even higher now than they were in the old Russia.

III. Conclusion

The wholehearted effort of the Soviet government to extend the opportunities of higher education to the great masses and to organize education in the light of the carefully determined needs of the State is unquestionably without precedent in the history of Russia or any other country. The willingness of the government to support all education, including education at the upper levels, at a time when the country is far from prosperous can only call forth the most favorable comment. One should not lose sight of the fact, however, that the educational work which goes forward in Russia at present is not an alien plant suddenly transferred to Russian soil. Rather, except for its strong Marxian coloring, it is but the realization of old ideals advocated by such Russian educational leaders as Tolstoy and Pirogov. The great credit due the Soviet government lies in the fact that it has provided an opportunity for the fruition of the age-long aspirations of the Russian people.

Man Can Know

Concerning the "Mind" of the Contemporary American Writer

By Gorham B. Munson

THE READER can fancy, if he wishes, that this dialogue takes place between a young man who is of an inquiring turn and an older thoroughly experienced man of the world who is sufficiently interested to make answers. Let the scene be on shipboard one day out from New York. It is after tea time and the speakers resting in their deck chairs are free of distractions and in a mood to talk directly and earnestly.

But possibly the reader will prefer to regard this dialogue as the interior conversation that goes on in one when one ponders a matter of some extent and consequence. For pondering is a process of addressing questions to one's own knowledge and experience: one hopes for and looks for the answers in oneself: sometimes after much intangible wrestling, answers come.

I wish—now that we have removed a little from his company—that you would give me a description of the mind of the American writer today.

Well, of course, you do not mean those practical people, the avowed journalists, the versifiers and story-writers who boil the pot so expertly, the incorporated purveyors of popular sentiment, for these writers have no need of mind: a keen practical sense is their principal feature.

Quite right. I draw the usual line between journalistic practicality and literary idealism and refer to those poets, novelists, playwrights and critics who take their vocations seriously—supposedly at least; who have, or pretend to have, a passion for literature; and who fill the pages of our liberal and radical weeklies and our monthly magazines of *belles lettres;* who write the books that these publications find worthy for extended comment. To simplify consideration, I exclude from my request the professional philosophers, the psychologists and the economists.

And by mind just what do you mean?

That is rather difficult to define. But I believe it can be said that there is a faculty for *taking thought* as distinct from the faculty for using words, formulating reactions, running out a chain of associated ideas, repeating received ideas, for, in general, ordinary "thinking." One

practises ordinary "thinking" when one makes comparisons or contrasts between New York and Paris, let us say, or between Hawthorne and Poe, but mind is posterior and superior to speech, clusters of associated ideas, and perceptions of likenesses and differences. Mind's process is contemplation: its subject matter is large true facts, such as the organization of the universe, the inevitability of death, the swarms of human beings that compose the entity called mankind: and its aim is to grasp the objects of its contemplation as wholes. That is taking thought.

I am glad you state it that way, for the answer is now easy. The American writer, as a rule, has no mind.

But surely he is not so incurious that he has never wrestled with the problem of the universe and his place therein, with the problem of life and its possible significance. He does not appear to sit so easily in the scheme of things that these matters can be lightly dismissed.

I repeat that the American writer, as a rule, has no mind, for mind, according to your definition, is essentially an active faculty. A short time ago I read an answer by one of our rising naturalistic novelists to a request for a statement on his attitude toward life and letters. "I have no opinions," he said, "no morals, no money, no balance, no brains, no bottom, no beliefs, no aspirations and a hell of a lot of friends." Now it would be unfair to subscribe the American writer as a class to this blatant and slovenly announcement, and of course it's not a true statement. For beneath this sentence there lie a number of unconscious assumptions that are undoubtedly shared by this novelist's more guarded colleagues. But obviously unconscious assumptions can scarcely be said to make up a mind.

Well, since you refuse to credit the American writer with a mind, perhaps you will at least state these unconscious assumptions that influence him.

First of all, the American writer is aware of his general ignorance. He does not know what life is, he does not know what the purpose of life may be. That is good, provided he is fully and continually impressed with the fact of his ignorance—which he is not. What is unwarranted is his assumption that it is impossible to know these ultimate secrets.

But surely that is more than an assumption. It is a conclusion drawn from a survey of blind human strayings in history, from a knowledge of the frontiers that scientists and philosophers have encountered, from a considerable inherited racial experience that proclaims: man cannot know!

But I must remind you that we have also inherited a tradition, in which are studded the names of Pythagoras, Buddha and Jesus, that *man can know*—if he will take the trouble. Judged by the effectiveness of their works which radically changed broad currents of human behavior, these men had an immense knowledge of life. They represent possibilities that we cannot call impossibles unless—we demonstrate by our works that we are greater than they, that we have gone farther than they did.

You bring forward dubious figures haloed by legends.

But my test is objective. By their fruits, ye shall know them. By our fruits, we too are known. You have only to compare the two.

But man is only a part, an infinitesimal part, within a gigantic whole. How then can he know that whole?

You are stating another assumption of the American writer. The tradition which I mentioned is opposed. It says that man is a whole within a whole, an empire within an empire, a microcosm of a macrocosm, and therefore if he knows himself, a miniature world, he will necessarily come to know the great world.

Prove it!

But I am not arguing for this view. I am merely saying that the American writer does not take cognizance of these rival assumptions—we call them that for the moment—as a truly free intelligence would. The former's "thinking" follows one track only. It is impossible to know ultimate answers because man is a part within a whole and a part cannot know the whole. To cap it, he is usually inclined to believe that intelligence is a freak created by accident millions of years ago. And here I say to you, prove that!

Of course, I can't prove it. It is pure conjecture.

Nevertheless, the American writer is more friendly to this conjecture than he is to the evidence advanced by the theorists who hold that intelligence was created by design. But granted that these assumptions of inscrutability, partiality and freakishness have a great deal of plausibility, still you must admit that the practical conclusion the American writer draws from them is puerile. He says that since man does not know what his cosmic function is, therefore it does not matter to man what he does. But, on the contrary, it does make a difference. Suppose we give a farm to an ignoramus for cultivation. This ignoramus has no conception of the purpose relative to man of a farm and spends his days idly sunning or shading himself according to the temperature. Finally, he starves to death. We would feel that at least the ignoramus might have made the effort by observation and investigation to discover a possible purpose for the farm we entrusted to him. The case of the ignorant writer is an exact analogue.

But I do not agree that the American writer is so grossly irresponsible. He has his set of values.

True. His first value is a high self-valuation. Forgetful of his own deep and broad ignorance and convinced of mankind's irresponsibility, he hastens to assign the creativity manifested in works of art as the justification of existence. The artist is converted into the superior being and all his wretchedness, his sins and his weaknesses are forgiven if he creates fine poems or statues or paintings. Compared to a man of business, he may be wildly impractical: compared to a mathematician, he may be weakly intellectual: compared to a saint, he may be a flabby self-indulgent creature; yet is he, by virtue of his emotional irritability, the lord of all these. Mankind toils and suffers that a few one-sided "sports"—the artists—may create and beautify the spectacle of man to man. In the face of the immense processions of history—the numerous civilizations and cultures that have flowered, withered and disappeared beyond recording, each civilization with its thousands of artists the majority of whom were positive that they were creating enduring works—this assigned function for man of creating art appears to be unduly pretentious. "Beauty" is notoriously transient. Against the background of human history, against the background of countless solar systems, against the vast foreground of the future, the creation of "beauty" dwindles to an insubstantial and forlorn purpose. The princes of mankind should have more commensurate functions.

You are too austere. After all, not immortality but pleasure derived from his work is the artist's reward.

Pleasure is an affair of the emotions and has nothing to do with the mind. It is true that the motive of the American writer is situated in pleasure, and he receives his pleasure from two sources: either from his good workmanship in which case he is enslaved by his medium or from a literary career in which case he is magnetized by the esteem of his community, the privileges of a literary man, and the social and monetary rewards of writing. But it does not occur to him to situate, if possible, his motive in the discovery and conquest of the world which can only be undertaken by mind *overseeing the materials supplied by the organism.* You see that all the working assumptions of the American writer carry him away from the development of mind.

Does that matter greatly?

It may matter very much. Nietzsche, you recall, looked on the artist as a caster of glamor over objects. Now the artist by virtue of his suggestive power (his magic) may

glorify either psychological progression or retrogression. He may, like Rousseau, intensify the attractiveness of purely instinctive and emotional living, or he may, like Plato, confer luminosity upon the intellect. It may be that our artists today are betraying us by denigrating the intellect: it may be they are blindly luring us over a cliff to drown in a sea of sensuality. At any rate, a man's hope of attaining wisdom would seem to lie, not in casting away part of his psychological wealth, but in conserving *all* his resources for use as his instrument for knowledge.

But don't you think that the American writer with his youth, his energy, his rebelliousness, may yet work for psychological progression, as you call it?

Only if he learns to revise his attitude toward life. Nowadays he reaches the acceptance of the body, but what estimate does he place upon the body? Is the body acceptable because it is sometimes enjoyable or is it acceptable because, whether enjoyable or painful, it is solely by the ownership of it that one can learn about the world? We land, I fear, in a muddle, for the American writer, recoiling from the dry legalism of puritanism, asserts only that the body is good. But good for what? It was once customary to say: I *have* a body. Today we say in effect: I am a body. "And if the body were not the soul, what is the soul?" intoned Walt Whitman. We should be able to measure with more precision, if we wish to boast of possessing a mind. . . . There are other tough-rooted obstacles to the development of the American writer.

Such as, I suppose, his die-hard optimism.

That is one, and another is the Occidental prejudice for individualism. Our writers are very expectant folk. They really expect to have a renaissance simply by sliding along in the direction they are now working. One day, so they imagine, the solar ecstasy of a renaissance will possess them without their changing their habits in the least. They endorse the gospel of practical failure; they endorse the doctrine of specialization; yet they expect so to move America with a rounded suffused vision that we shall experience a national rebirth. But it requires knowledge, development and power, an escape from being a type-man to being a complete man, to generate a renaissance. To become the promoter of a renaissance, one must transform one's narrow personal psychology into a general human psychology, and for that transformation what is required? A method and the most difficult training. That is where we run foul of the Western prejudice of individualism.

How? I thought that self-reliance was the great victory of the European Renaissance.

It was, but it was a one-sided triumph as that profound American critic, Irving Babbitt, has demonstrated. We won self-reliance, but at the expense of humility, and individualism as we understand it, that is, the cultivation of personal uniqueness, has run wildly random. We have come to believe that genius must be untutored. It is a gift. Either you have it or do not have it, and in either eventuality you cannot be taught. The East has not believed in that, for it makes mysticism a course of study. For myself, I think it arrogant and foolish to ignore that half of human experience represented by the Orient and fully agree with Professor Babbitt that we would do well to complement Occidental self-reliance with Oriental humility.

I confess that if you are thinking of Hindu psychological strenuousness, that sort of schooling is repugnant to me.

A reaction, of course, and not a judgment. Now you resemble an American writer. The latter will have none of the scientific methodology that undeniably produced the *Mahabharata*. Very well! Has the American writer a better method?

His method appears to be fermentation. He lives unconsciously—that is, without design—for a time, and then one day to his delight he finds that he has something to say and a form to say it in.

Say rather that his method is accident. Contents in the form of sensations, emotions and images flood into his organism, group themselves, drop out of sight, squirm about. Over the reception of these contents he has little or no control. Over their disposition in himself he has little or no control. But one day he is moved to commit a small fraction of them to paper, that fraction that he happens at the moment to be able to recall. How far does this method take him? Merely to the expression of his likes and dislikes. He becomes the typical American reforming novelist, perhaps.

According to your view, then, the American writer, lacking a mind, is simply a reactor. That would account for his constant occupation with the politics, the economics, the social structure, the dullness of people, the propaganda for this or that morality—all ephemera of the decades in which he happens to be writing. It would account further for his failure to pass beyond this immediate circle of interests.

Yes, my view is that his method limits him in the way you describe. I would like to add that his method is based upon a very dangerous fallacy. It is the common belief that a renaissance comes from below up. Some writers feel that it comes from the soil, others that it will come from the working classes, still others just now expect regeneration from the rhythmic instinctive vitality and emotional lushness of the Negro. I cannot agree. If we study the operation of the Pythagorean renaissance in Greece and of the European Renaissance in Italy, we shall see that such cultural rebirths come from above down. The stimulus must come from a source higher than our own cultural level. That is why I favor Professor Babbitt's proposal, because I foresee the possibility that India may be for us the lofty vital impulse from antiquity that Hellas was for Italy. Do you not perceive that on the smaller scale of the individual the doctrine of ferment implies that the finest creation comes from below up, that creation is best when it is a product of the unconscious instinctive and emotional levels of human existence? It leads man to reshaping that which he has already actualized and not to bodying forth his potentials among which is mind.

What then do you propose as a program for the American writer?

I propose simply this. That he raise the various assumptions we have spoken of to his consciousness and *keep them there in everything he writes.* Doing so, he will be able to use them to make allowances for error whenever he is tempted to be cocksure or pompous. If we are to be skeptical, then let us be thoroughly skeptical, for a shallow skepticism paradoxically turns out to be credulity. As resolute skeptics we shall stress the fundamentals we do not know instead of the little facts we think we know. Next let the American writer take daily thought on his list of unknowables. Let him as a frequent gratuitous exercise turn his attention to such questions as God, the universe, death, the problem of pain, the totality of mankind, the function of man, the problem of knowledge and the way thereto. I said gratuitous, but such exercises will not be purely gratuitous. For suppose that his use of mind leads to no certitudes, yet will he gain elevation of tone and subject matter in his writing. At the least then and on his own terms, he will become a more distinguished artist, for elevation of style is still, I believe, esteemed a noble literary virtue.

CLAY HILLS

The yellow roadway swells and dips
Like a sleeping camel's back;
A beetle crawls from neck to hips,
An auto on its homeward track.

—Kenneth W. Porter

Dartmouth in War and Peace

By LEONARD W. DOOB

OUT of a war-time college course of the most blatantly propagandistic nature has evolved at Dartmouth in time of peace a realistic and uncolored course that delves into the mechanics of modern society. The two pamphlets which describe this course under the vicissitudes of war and the comparative freedom of peace tell an interesting story and speak eloquently for the future.

Educationally speaking, they point out a definite change in technique which the peace-time Dartmouth has been able to achieve over the war-stricken college. Whether the liberalism that is now being taught in the Choate House will be able to survive another war, as Meiklejohn and Holmes and others were able to stand out during the past debacle, is a question worth raising and one deserving of our prayers.

The titles of the two pamphlets from which I shall quote liberally are: "Issues of the World War" published in 1918, and "The Courses in Problems of Citizenship" for the first semester, 1928-29.

In the Preface to the first pamphlet appears:

"In the month of September, 1918, the War Department created the 'Students' Army Training Corps, and a unit of the Corps was established at Dartmouth College. One of the requirements of the Department was that a 'Course on the Issues of the War' be given to all members of the Corps with a few exceptions. In the language of the bulletin issued by the Committee on Education and Special Training of the War Department, the purpose of this course was 'to enhance the morale of the members of the Corps by giving them an understanding of what the War is about and the supreme importance to civilization of the cause for which we are fighting' and 'to make the issues of the War a living reality to each man.'"

All of this means that the faculty at Dartmouth College *had* to propagandize, for listening to both sides of a question never filled men with enthusiasm for the trenches. The War Department ironically enough made the expressed aim of the course "to give an understanding of the underlying conflicts of points of view, as expressed in the governments, philosophies and literatures of the various states on both sides of the struggle." But to have given anyone the point of view that the German people per se had nothing to do with causing the War would have subjected the instructor to federal persecution and social disgrace.

And so seventeen highly respectable and highly respected members of the faculty employed their intellectual resources to formulate such a course. "For the first term of twelve weeks, Germany and England were taken as the two typical states representing conflicting points of view." The same would have been done with other conflicting powers and "some of the social, governmental, and economic questions" of the War would have been discussed had not peace been declared.

A "quotation from the speech of President Wilson at Mt. Vernon, July 4, 1918, was printed on large cards and placed conspicuously in every lecture room where the course was given." The quotation: "What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind." Italy and Poland and Spain please copy.

Hazen's *Modern European History* and Lowell's *Greater European Governments* were used as general texts. But many were the required readings of the Committee on Public Information, whose high-powered propaganda created a record in world history. Later confessions and research have brought forth exposés of the Committee in Creel's *How We Advertised America.*

The opening exercise, supervised by a professor in History, was a lecture on "Democracy and Autocracy; Prussia and Germany to 1848." Make your own inferences from this summary which is all we have of the lecture:

"a. Introduction: aim of War and of the course; scheme for this quarter.

"b. Underlying conflict between Democracy and Autocracy.

"c. Prussia, the core of Germany; sketch of the rise of Prussia; Germany to 1848.

"d. Three grounds for America's entrance into War."

The history of Germany was continued and the point of view presented which we had to learn in our grammar school that the World War was just the culmination of the evil activities started by the unworthy Bismarck. At the moment it is perfectly fascinating to compare this with the work of Barnes, Ewart, Fabre-Luce, Fay, Demartial, Monteglas, and Turner and then sit back and wonder in academic fashion.

There followed the Theory and Structure of the German State by a Political Science Professor. Topic c. in the summary lists the following points as "Logical Developments:"

"1. Individual rights denied. 2. Right and duty to make war. 3. Small states must perish. 4. Treaties not binding. 5. General arbitration inconceivable. 6. International Law absurd."

A question on a quiz may illuminate the general tenor of the teaching:

"1. Describe the Reichstag: How chosen? Size? Length of term? Powers (indicating points of weakness)? Is it a *representative body?*" (Italics not mine.)

Finally the philosophical background of Germany was given with emphasis on the war ideas of Nietzsche and Treitschke—at least this seems to be a reasonable inference from the outline. Accurate information no doubt was required under every topic, but not all the available information could be presented.

The same ground was then covered for England, even though the War had ended. Then in December the trade rivalry and colonization and the general contrasting economic conditions were emphasized, with the final *piece de resistance* a description of the immediate political movements which men thought led to the numerous ultimata and then the outbreak.

Since as a piece of co-operative teaching it was successful, the course developed into Dartmouth's present Citizenship Course. In the words of its pamphlet:

". . . It aims to stimulate an interest for future work in social science courses. . . . Final judgments, based upon the meager data which the course presents, are actively discouraged; it is an important part of the intent of the course to show that problems of the type discussed are far too intricate to be dismissed with easy generalization . . . the course attempts to give some conception of the painful gathering of facts . . ., of the courses in the college curriculum where such material is presented, and of certain working methods. . . ."

At the moment (for the course changes with man's knowledge), the race question is presented by the Negro DuBois and the Jewish Lewisohn along with the contrasting theories of Stoddard and Langdon-Davies; under Government, democracy is not accepted as a static institution but is questioned by Becker in reference to the "degree to which [its] aims have been realized," by Merriam and Gosnell who are worried about non-voting, by Laidler who summarizes more radical proposals for change, by Barnes in the light of the new criminology, and by Haynes, Moon and Clarke in regard to its international relationships; and a similar technique is used to discuss the topics of economic organization, the family, religion and education.

Undergraduates are familiar with the course, to be sure. The men who teach the freshmen have no proverbial axe to grind—in fact, like true social scientists, they aren't even aware of an axe. This last, however, may need some qualification. There is a tendency to a partial and one-sided presentation of some of the theories. This feeling of negativism which many feel pervades the course is a natural phenomenon coming as a reaction to the dogmatic ideology of the War on the one hand and the desire to oppose all propaganda on the other. This debunking process, combined with the student's own ideas inbred in the home and acquired in the secondary school and with the remainder of the college course, does not prevent a state of mental equilibrium and roundness from being achieved.

The reason why it is necessary to drag this old skeleton out of the faculty closet is because it seems useful to point out again and again what happens to our beautiful notions of education or liberalism or mental integrity when we are caught up by the hurricane of a national hysteria. The most important implication is in regard to the future. Will the liberalizing effect which The Course in Problems of Citizenship has, be sufficiently strong if we have another war? Will we who are fortunate in being able to realize that some of our contemporaries have been duped by such a body as the Committee on Information be able to capitalize this knowledge? Or will we allow ourselves to be carried away by another myth, another apparent certainty which only the passing of years will be able to puncture?

Unrest in the Negro Colleges

By JOHN DAVIS

THE recurrence of disorders ranging from summary expulsions of individual students to wholesale student strikes in Negro colleges will tell even the most casual observer that something is radically wrong. But what that something is will require more than casual analysis. One thing is certain: The Negro student is not what he used to be. And this certainty is creating a deal of disquietude in many circles. The white philanthropist is becoming wary of contributing to the cause of Negro education, because of the seeming spirit of revolt. The parent of the student is perplexed about conditions. The school executive is trying to straddle both sides of the stream of discontent by a partial amelioration of student regulations and the reassurance to the white trustee boards that the situation is not beyond their control. Meanwhile the Negro student, himself, is straining under rules and regulations which seem to him unbearable. The whole situation is dense as a London fog. That the root of the difficulty is traceable to any single cause is obviously too erroneous to require serious refutation. To get at the basis of the trouble, involving as it does a multiplicity of differing factors, requires intricate analysis. Perhaps, the surest method of arriving at specific conclusions is to examine the external and easily ascertainable facts. And such is the purpose of this article.

To the uninformed, notice of a student strike will not seem spectacular. They have always existed in northern white colleges as a legitimate means of letting off sophomoric steam, never accomplishing a great deal, and seldom seriously affecting the actual affairs of the college. Of course, here and there, are exceptions, but their very existence proves the general rule: that student strikes have come to be regarded as an unavoidable and periodic liability of the white college. Not so the Negro college. Until late years a college education has been looked on as a sacred and difficult attainment by the Negro student. Economically bound by almost impregnable fetters, the Negro student had no time for anything but the acquisition of a meager education in a poorly equipped college, long on religion and miserably short on the necessary requisites of a liberal college education. If the Negro student did get to college, he was generally so poor that what leisure time was his had to be spent working at odd hours to feed and clothe himself. Leisure was almost unknown. This is the background of the situation. Then came the War. With it came a tremendous betterment of the economic conditions in the southern Negro home. More students came to college. Fewer found it necessary to work their way through school. The radio, the newspaper, the moving picture, the spread of liberal ideas, and the *élan vital* of the Negro Renaissance developing into the concept of the "New Negro," all conspired to send to the threshold of the Negro college a new type of student, wholly unprecedented. Little wonder that the Negro college, that had remained almost static, was poorly prepared to receive such a student.

In 1924, a group of students at Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee, one of the outstanding Negro institutions in the South, struck. Various reasons are given for the strike. Dr. DuBois of the *Crisis*, is accused by some of inciting the otherwise docile student body to active rebellion. The students are said to have resented the wholesale tyranny of the then President Fayette Avery McKenzie. That conditions were intolerable can scarcely be denied. Students were required to be in bed by ten o'clock. There was no card playing or smoking in the dormitories. The food was poor, the dormitories crowded. To walk beside a woman student on campus was forbidden. Strict religious devotion was imperative and dancing was considered a trap of the Devil. The Negro members on the faculty were treated with mild indifference and all power was centered in a president whose idea of Negro education was to teach the Negro how to live in silent subservience to white over-lordship. Well, a small group of pioneers struck. A few lights were turned off, students remained away from class and strolled about the campus;—and McKenzie called southern white policemen to put the ringleaders in jail. Patrol wagons came on the campus and took loads of students away. The next day the southern white press was filled with diatribes on the unsuccessful attempts to educate "niggers." But by this time Fisk parents and alumni were awake to the situation and resentment, which had long been dormant, crystallized. The doors of the school were practically closed, nearly the entire student body left, and McKenzie stole away under cover of night fearing personal violence and sent his resignation to the Board of Trustees. Now the interference of municipal authorities in the private affairs of a college community is without precedent so far as I know, anywhere. At Harvard, Yale and Massachusetts Institute of Techonology, where there were serious riots causing the damage of much property and many assaults on innocent pedestrians, the college authorities not only handled the affair behind closed doors but furnished legal aid to such students as had become involved in misdemeanors. Obviously the action of McKenzie was reprehensible. As a result of this notoriety the University remained disorganized for nearly two years. Its normal supply of annual donations fell from over fifteen thousand dollars to almost nothing.

The strike at Fisk was followed by a similar one at Howard University in Washington, D. C. Conditions were not so bad as at Fisk, but they were bad enough. Again a white president attempted a reign of anarchy, and again he lost his head. The provocation for the strike was a revolt against compulsory R. O. T. C. Four of Howard's most distinguished professors were summarily dismissed for "economic reasons" and then given a year's additional pay *without service*. The reason for this strange economy

was the liberal-minded attitude of these professors toward student opinion.

And there have been other strikes, two at Howard in addition to the above, at Kittrell, at St. Augustine, and at Knoxville College. There have been revolts almost equivalent to strikes in nearly every Negro college in the South. These were obviated in many instances only by wholesale expulsion of large parts of the student body. Only last year Hampton Institute was the scene of another bloody battle for Negro student liberty. The immediate cause of the strike was the turning on of lights during the showing of a moving picture, blurring the entire picture in order to save the students from what the faculty deemed to be serious moral turpitude. Here white faculty members were accused of belonging to the Ku Klux Klan. Negro faculty members at this place ate at separate tables. Practically every moment of the student's time was prescribed in most minute fashion, and any infraction of the rules led to summary expulsion. The students are told what clothes to wear. There is no smoking and no dancing.

Obviously these external facts will furnish a partial basis for understanding conditions in Negro colleges. Do they still exist? Let us see. I am quoting from the college catalogues of several of the leading schools in the South:

Talladega College prescribes the following: (the capitals are mine):

> "Discipline is administered with a view to moral development of the student as well as the peace and good order of the institution. A scrupulous regard for rules is required from each student. When it becomes plain that such regard is refused or the student has no fixed purpose to benefit from advantages offered, SUCH STUDENT IS REMOVED WITHOUT SPECIFIC CHARGE."

Such is the fascism of Talladega.

At Tougaloo College smoking is forbidden, women are not allowed to receive men callers; and in the language of the catalogue: *"All incoming mail will pass through the hands of the preceptresses and is subject to their inspection."* Needless to say this article has very little chance of reaching students at Tougaloo. And whatever their complaint, it is obvious that there are effective methods of preventing them from ever reaching beyond the walls of this Christian institution.

At Storr College there are similar restrictions including *"the right of the college to inspect mail and expressage and to dispose of the same in any way desirable."* Imagine putting such a rule into effect at Dartmouth or Smith! Modesty forbids my quoting from the catalogue of Lane College in Jackson, Tennesse. Suffice to say that the rules are essentially as above, plus the stipulation of what the students must wear even down to undergarments. At Atlanta University there is no card playing, no smoking, no dancing. There are women matrons in men's dormitories and the men must be in their rooms with lights out at ten o'clock.

At West Virginia Collegiate Institute in addition to most of the above the catalogue requirements are as follows:

> "Dress: Extravagance in dress is discouraged. Simple yet neat clothing is approved. Each young woman should be provided with at least two woolen skirts, two white waists, two percale waists and two blue percale dresses. The skirts should be made of navy blue serge.
>
> "What to bring: Pupils should notify the President of their intention to become students of this school and must bring napkins, toothbrush, comb and brush, blacking and brush, toilet soap, laundry bag, Bible and dictionary. Each boy should bring one overall suit. All students must provide themselves with overshoes and umbrellas."

At A and T College, Greensboro, North Carolina as at Hampton and Tuskegee, there is compulsory chapel; regulation uniforms are required; matrons rule men's dormitories; students are forbidden to entertain visitors in their rooms; playing cards and tobacco are forbidden on the campus. Everything is done to make "Universal Robots" out of grown men and women. Nothing is left to their own initiative. The following is the student's daily schedule at A and T. It is similar to those at Hampton and Tuskegee:

> "Rise at six o'clock; dressing and arranging rooms, 6 to 6:45; inspection, 6:45; breakfast, 7:00; morning session, 8 to 12; chapel, 12 to 12:15; dinner, 12:30 to 1; afternoon session, 1:15 to 4:10; study, 7:00 to 10:00 P. M.; inspection, 9:45; retiring signal lights out, 10:15 P. M."

Such conditions as these exist generally in practically all of the Negro colleges in the South. They are based on two fallacies: 1. That the Negro student is not prepared for the exercise of the free will. Back of this is the fear of the white educator that if the Negro is allowed the exercise of liberty, he will become too dangerous to live in the southern white community. Every effort is made to teach servility and pacifism. But the Negro student has long since given up the motto of his predecessors in college: "Take the world and give me Jesus." He is willing to share his Jesus if the white man will share his world. 2. The other is the current belief that the white trustee and executive knows unerringly the best method of Negro education. This is the vital fault of the benevolent despotism of white educators and philanthropists. They look on Negro students as members of a child race, thinking they know just the kind of soothing syrup they need. They are determined to stuff it down the throats of Negro students, if they have to choke them to death in doing it. These two points of view are largely to blame for the vicious restrictions on the Negro student. The colleges headed by Negroes, suffer from the same fate because they are still largely dependent on white capital. And it is the old story of "whose bread I eat his song I sing."

Still another tragedy of the Negro college is its poorly equipped faculty. The white members of the faculty are either the old missionary type with little knowledge of scientific pedagogy or the young, untrained graduate using the Negro college to gain teaching experience. Then too there is Lincoln University where they don't accept Negroes on the faculty although there the entire student body is Negro. A faculty member in most institutions is chosen more with regard to his moral attitude than to his actual preparation and equipment.

In an article of this length it is difficult to give more than a rapid survey of conditions. There are many factors entering into the problem of student unrest as I intimated in the beginning. The outlook for the future is dependent, I believe, on a liberalization of student regulations, the abolition as soon as possible, not of all white teachers, but certainly of those who are obviously paternalistic or incompetent. At this stage in the growth of Negro education it is imperative that there be an increasing number of trained executives, who are something more than missionaries to Japan or China: men of scholarship, men of sound business ability, I don't care whether they be black or white. It is essential now that white trustee boards shall not dominate with benevolent despotism the affairs of the college, but that Negroes of integrity and honor shall have a larger voice in the education of their sons and daughters. This eternal catering to southern white sentiment must stop. If it does not there will be strikes and rumors of strikes, destructive of effort it is true, but resulting in a new day for the Negro student.

Arkansas Plays the Clown

By PAUL PAGE FARIS

ON November 2 there appeared in the *Arkansas Gazette* an editorial under the heading, "Shall Arkansas Make Itself a Laughing Stock?" The editorial was opposing in rather certain terms the anti-evolution bill which was to come before the people in the regular November election.

The *Gazette* was not the only one opposing the bill. The same day on which the editorial appeared, Dr. Vergil L. Jones, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Arkansas, was quoted as saying that the passage of the bill would be "a long step backward," and "a vote for religious oppression." Arkansas, he said, should profit by the example of Oklahoma, who in 1926 put herself on record as declining to turn her institutions of higher learning into "asylums for those who are forbidden to think."

Rev. Charles Franklin, too, Methodist minister of Parkin, Arkansas, wrote to the *Gazette* on November 1 deploring the "unfortunate" movement to pass laws forbidding the teaching of evolution in state-supported schools. And as far back as February, 1927, when the bill was being agitated in the legislature, the Education Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, declared itself against "all legislation that would interfere with the proper teaching of science in . . . schools and colleges."

But election day came. The theory of evolution and Alfred E. Smith suffered the same fate. In the words of J. F. Hammett D.D.S., president of the Arkansas Anti-Evolution League, an "enlightened public" had spoken. That enlightened public had made it unlawful, in Arkansas schools supported in whole or in part by the state, to teach the doctrine that "man either ascended or descended from a lower order of animals."

Those who had fought for the bill were gloriously exultant when it passed. The wild ringing of bells on Armistice Day probably seemed to be proclaiming more than one triumph to A. L. Rotenberry, author of the bill, for he took November 11 as the date on which he could thank through the *Gazette* the people who had helped him achieve his aim: "I consider this victory a signal victory," he said, "in view of the fact that we were vigorously opposed by some tremendous odds, including the public press, the leading political heads, school and college heads, professional men and even many ministers."

Who, we might ask, gave this signal victory to Mr. Rotenberry and his confreres? Mr. Rotenberry has in part answered the question himself in the statement just quoted. The bill, he says, was opposed by the educated people of Arkansas, including "many ministers." Whom does that leave to have favored it?

Most of the blame is laid, by those who know more about it than I, on two factions: it was favored by a number of militant southern Baptists, and it was favored by that great number of simple, uneducated souls who live in the outlying districts of the state. Both of these factions were sincere; they voted honestly for a measure which they thought would by public proclamation protect and preserve religion and man's superiority.

And now that the bill is on the books as law, what, we might ask further, is going to be done about it? So far as positive action against it is concerned, it seems at this date that nothing will be done about it. The passage of the bill has aroused surprisingly little feeling. Those who opposed it before its passage, if their lack of public expression since is any guide, have taken their defeat in a frame of mind stoical to say the least.

The newspapers of November 9 carried the statement that the heads of state-supported schools would make no attempt to evade the law. On November 11, the World Book, a ten-volume reference which contains a summary of the evolution theory, was struck off by the State Department of Education from its list of recommended references. It *might* conflict with the law.

There have been rumors of organized opposition. The papers spoke of a group of lawyers, business men, and physicians who intended to try the sharpness of the law's teeth. And the southern attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union (the organization which sponsored the Scopes trial) stated on November 15 that he would recommend to the Union the bringing of a test case. But nothing further has been heard from either of these; and since the latter part of November, not even the newspapers have been able to ferret out any new group laying plans for an active campaign. That a Supreme Court decision be obtained has been requested by the *Gazette*, with the warning however that "the less 'monkey state' notoriety Arkansas gets, the better." But that is as far, it seems, as people care to go.

What will be done by the instructors in the state-supported schools? That is a difficult question to answer, but it is probably safe to say that they will for the meanwhile consider discretion the better part of valor. One biology instructor in a state-supported college has worked out an interesting scheme. He has cut from his own text all portions dealing with evolution. His students retain their texts intact, but do not bring them onto the campus. They continue, with the approval of the president, to study the offending portions at home.

The law, of course, is quite vague. Whether "teaching" evolution includes merely stating dispassionately what the theory is, no one knows for sure. Ben M. Bogard, president of the American Anti-Evolution Association, has attempted to explain the law. "It simply prohibits," he said, "forcing religious people to support the teaching of evolution in the tax-supported schools." It does not prevent (and here is room for a number of wise-cracks), a teacher from stating how to improve animals by breeding. "But," warns Mr. Bogard, "if there should be a teacher so foolish as to teach that a domestic animal could be so improved and developed that it will cease to be that sort of animal and become a man or some other sort of animal then he would find himself prohibited by law." If that is all the law means it is foolish perhaps, but it will cause few difficulties. However, others dare to contradict so evident an authority as Mr. Bogard. The fact is that the law doesn't say clearly just what it does mean.

Besides being vague the law is weak. It cannot be enforced universally and at all times, for several of the same reasons that the prohibition law cannot. Yet, it can cause embarrassment at any time, and so all the teachers are afraid. Like lightning, the hand of the law may spare for a year and then drop suddenly and devastatingly upon an unexpecting victim.

The head of one college biology department has stated to the writer that many of the best teachers will be unwilling to remain in a state where their teaching is materially crippled by, and where their personal safety is always in danger from, a hazily understood law. They will move out, he says, and go to other states where theories are not proved or disproved by majority vote.

The instructors in general seem to see little likelihood of profit in a test case. A test case, unless carried out with superhuman skill and foresight, probably would settle nothing definitely. Some sensible means of obtaining an adequate Supreme Court decision is what the instructors want. In the meantime, for this school year at least, they all will bide their time, believing with Milton that, "They also serve who only stand and wait."

The Intercollegiate World

The Amateur Sport Business In Our Colleges

The Romance of Football. Someone ought to write an article about football for the *American Magazine* or the *Post*, under this title. Football has been the hero of an Alger tale, too. In 1890, twenty thousand people witnessed the Yale-Harvard game; in 1928 eighty thousand attended.

If the profits rolled up by Yale's football team during the fiscal year ending June, 1928, were turned over to Bowdoin and Colby, two colleges together enrolling 1,150 students, they would be enabled to operate for a year with a deficit of less than $12,500. According to an article in the *Yale Alumni Weekly*, Harvard's total receipts from colonial grants and gifts for all purposes during the first hundred and eighty-four years lacked more than $43,000 of equalling Yale's last year's football profits.

What becomes of the millions earned by football teams each year? Most of it goes to pay for bigger stadiums in order to be able to collect higher gate receipts. Defenders of football say that it goes to support intramural games. Mr. John Tunis in his book, $port$ (John Day $2.50), shows pretty conclusively that very little of it is spent for that purpose.

Football "Makes Whoopee" for Culture. Football is the best device yet invented for making culture hum. A dean of Northwestern University testifies: "Yes, even in the mind of the man on the street, the fellow who never went to college, the man in the grocery store, the tobacco clerk on the corner, there is a new feeling about Northwestern. I have sensed it all over the country. I found it on the west coast. . . .

"Beyond a doubt the success of football is tremendous advertising for the university. I am a realist on that subject. I believe that the tail wags the dog. . . ."

Stanford's product is also selling well this year, as a student remarks in the *Stanford Daily*, "Stanford, with the assistance of the varsity and President-elect Hoover, is now running a race with Harvard for the foremost position among American universities."

Football is meat for the university publicity bureau, a bureau whose business it is to see that the university gets at least as much column space in the newspapers as any other institution. No academic news is accepted half so readily as football news. Consequently football becomes an important part of the college ballyhoo. *The Oregon Emerald*, of the University of Oregon, argues for intersectional games, using this publicity as the main argument. This year's game with a California college netted eighty-eight columns of publicity. At the same time a rival Oregon school was getting one hundred times as much space, through an intersectional game that was being reported by papers all over the country. Therefore, Oregon must go East next fall.

The astronomy department of any university would never lack for funds to buy new telescopes if its announced purpose was to find out whether there is an available football eleven on Mars for an inter-planetary game.

Whose Game is Football? Students at Ohio State University are asking this question since the appearance in a downtown paper of a straw ballot for the selection of a coach to succeed Dr. John W. Wilce. The meddlesome paper also published a cartoon which is characterized by the *Ohio State University Monthly* as boldly assuming "to dictate the policy by which the successor to the retiring coach should be named." The *Monthly* also says:

"Perhaps other universities have their problem of the 'Downtown Coach' but nowhere, it seems, is the malady more acute than in Columbus where overpassioned zealots in the cause of Bigger and Better Football Teams' go to the astounding lengths in the expression of their perfervid enthusiasm which may be well-intentioned, but ofttimes serve no good purpose."

The University of Nevada willingly turns its football affairs over to the townsfolk. It has been announced that the citizens of Reno will raise the sum of ten thousand dollars "or more if needed" to help pay coaches and establish scholarships for "needy and deserving athletes."

Even though football men didn't receive a cent for their effort—and in this university it appears that even the outward pretense of amateur principles is going to be brushed aside—it would be preposterous to assert that the game is amateur in spirit. Here are some of the groups that profit by the continuance of football as Big Business:

The college itself, through advertising.

The group of professionals who make a living by attending the eleven. In the book mentioned above, Mr, Tunis cites a typical case of a large eastern university that took in over a half million dollars during the 1924 football season. "Of that sum nearly $300,000, or more than half, was spent on various intercollegiate teams, travelling expenses, coaches, trainers, doctors, rubbers, uniforms and supplies."

The local merchants who benefit by the football crowds and who often have an even more direct interest in large gate receipts because they have underwritten new stadiums.

The newspapers, who profit by this national craze, from the moment when, early in September, "we read that Joe Ames, head coach of Hoosac University, is taking his squad away for early season practice in the country" to the choice of the last All-something-or-other eleven in December.

The only ones who are not supposed to profit by this game are those who do the playing. To pay them would be to sully that sacred sport with the dirty stain of commercialism.

Mr. Job, Class of 1914. These days are dark and dreary in the colleges that came through the recent football season with nothing more than moral victories. Letters are being written to college papers and alumni magazines by modern Jobs who put forth various explanations of the raw deal given them by the Great God Victory. "The coach is to blame.." Or, "college men nowadays prefer afternoon teas to tackling the dummy." Or, "we aren't getting the sort of men we used to."

The last complaint is the most popular among the alumni. At Cornell, where the coach complained several years ago that "the courses are so tough that they [the students] can't allow football to interfere," the alumni will probably organize a machine for recruiting the student who will not let his studies interfere with athletics. As the *Cornell Sun* remarks, these are days of cutthroat competition between the colleges for "promising" students.

The Dartmouth system of bringing in the right students is the one that may be adopted by the Cornell alumni. This scheme is described at length in a most revealing report of the Committee on Relations with Preparatory Schools, by Mr. Thomas I. S. Boak, '14. It is a highly organized system whereby the alumni in any locality interview all prospective students and pass upon their desirability, in a confidential report to the college authorities.

Mr. Boak's report is revealing because it discloses the purpose behind this assiduous search for the right student. He admits that the present Cornell student is satisfactory from the scholastic point of view, but the alumni ideal is a well-rounded man, and "a boy of well-rounded attainments will naturally be an athlete." This, Mr. Boak says, is not to be regarded as proselytizing for the athletic association, but the whole tenor of his report belies this statement. His concluding remark on the Dartmouth plan is, "Contrasting the action of Dartmouth and Cornell alumni in the matter of aiding in the selection of students, is it any wonder that Dartmouth wallops us regularly in athletics."

"Every well-informed alumnus," writes Mr. Boak, "knows the all around type of man he desires to see representing Cornell in scholastic, business, social and athletic life and can be relied upon to render sound judgment on the material for which such is to be made." If the well-informed alumnus really believes that the well-rounded student is one who will help wallop Dartmouth then the alumnus has a distorted view of education and it would be intellectually ruinous to a college to let him decide upon who shall attend it. A well-rounded student is one who develops a sound mind in a sound body and there is no evidence that football, especially the winning brand, contributes materially to either of these. *The New Student* is glad to find that all Cornell students do not agree with Mr. Boak. *The Sun* quotes his statement that "if Cornell needs anything at the present time, it is the presence on the hill of half a dozen boys who are real football players in addition to being able to keep up in their scholastic work." What Cornell needs more than this in *The Sun's* opinion, is "a new gymnasium and half a dozen professorial endowments.. . . ."

News Notes on Prohibition

NEWS notes on Prohibition in the colleges:

At the University of Michigan, President Little invited the Prohibition authorities to find out the extent of drinking on the campus.

Much and heated discussion was indulged in by various citizens of Virginia on the subject of student drinking at the State university. To the governor of Virginia the state superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League addressed a letter deploring the quantity of liquor consumed on the campus and asking the University to permit Federal prohibition agents "as uninterrupted access to the university grounds, fraternity houses, and student body as bootleggers are reputed to have."

"Well-dressed, with a pleasing manner and the air of a bona fide college student," a revenue officer appeared at a University of North Carolina fraternity house at the time of an intercollegiate football game, took down the names of all the fraternity bootleggers and casually appropriated all the wet goods in sight. He left the fraternity house by request, indignantly refusing to see why anyone should cherish any ill feeling, "since any honest citizen should be proud to help uphold the laws of the land."

All formal events for the balance of the school year have been forcibly canceled by the authorities at Colorado College because of drinking parties at a recent homecoming celebration. Commented *The Tiger*:

"The question of drinking at college functions was brought before the eyes of the school rather forcibly at the recent homecoming celebration. The atmosphere was redolent with fumes of corn whiskey and synthetic gin."

From the above items it appears that many college students are doing their best to live up to the standards set them by F. Scott Fitzgerald, Percy Marks and others. The advice given by student papers in instances like those described above has been uniformly one of expedience: Drink, if you must, but don't make public exhibitions of yourselves and thereby involve your university in profitless controversy.

God and the Student

THE college student's religious credo, according to a student writer in *The Stanford Daily*, Stanford University:

Probably fifty per cent of American students believe in God, but not the orthodox God. The atom, infinity, some physio-chemical force not yet known—these and other vague definitions constitute their conception of the Deity.

The average student neither prays nor believes in the efficacy of prayer, except as a sedative. Under stress of some great crisis he may pray silently, as a reversion to childhood training.

He does not believe in the soul or in life hereafter. Analyzing his deep sleep, he has concluded that death is the same sort of oblivion, plus the ceasing to function of certain nerves and muscles not controlled by the will. The thought of ceasing to be entirely is discouraging; therefore he covers it with some such philosophy as: you're here only a while—make the most of it. Or perhaps he believes that only through procreation is man immortal.

He has never read the Bible. Not all of it, anyhow.

He considers organized religions unnecessary in this age. For the persecutions of Galileo, of Copernicus, of Scopes, and hundreds of others who disseminated truth, he finds it difficult to forgive organized theology.

The average student has evolved, or is in the process of evolving, a personal religion which is actually a philosophy of life, a system of ethics. The Golden Rule or some expression thereof is generally the keynote of that philosophy. His other tenets may vary greatly. To orthodox people most of them would seem sinful and blasphemous.

Changing Law Education

AN important change in the methods and content of teaching law at the Columbia Law School has been announced. Not only will the student learn about law itself, but also about the social forces behind legal measures. This is said to be the most important change in law education since the case method was introduced.

In his annual report to President Nicholas Murray Butler, Dean Young B. Smith of the Law School, made some pertinent criticisms of the present methods of teaching the subject:

"It is the opinion of the Columbia Law Faculty that a major defect in the present education of law students is that their studies are too much confined to an examination of what may be called legal data. The study of law as now conducted in most American law schools consists chiefly of an examination of court decisions and statutes.

"Although these decisions and statutes deal with important economic, political and other social problems, the student's understanding of these problems is largely dependent upon such fragmentary knowledge as he may have acquired from the more or less general college courses which he happened to take. It is believed that much can be done to remedy this defect by a reorganization of the law school curriculum so as to focus the study of law against its economic, political and other social backgrounds."

On the Picket Line

HAVING investigated working conditions and found a notorious lack of Hoover prosperity, ten student organizations of Barnard, Columbia, and Hunter Colleges, and the College of the City of New York sent one student each to participate in the activities of the striking silk workers of Paterson, New Jersey.

At 7:30 in the morning the ten students were on their way to the picket line with placards bearing the following slogans:

College Men and Women Demand the Right of Labor to Organize; Intercollegiate Student Council Backs Union Labor; Paterson Silk Workers Have a Right to a Decent Wage; and No American Workers should Work More Than 8 Hours Daily.

The line formed, according to the *Barnard Bulletin's* story of the affair, "before a dirty, smoky building housing three shops, one of which was employing scabs. The ten students and some fifteen men and women workers walked slowly up and down. Two policemen, standing in front of the building, glanced first curiously and then stonily at the students and their signs. When one of the Columbia representatives spoke to a scab entering the doorway, a policeman, in the grand manner, informed him that it was against the law to 'intimidate a worker and don't talk to them again if you don't want to get arrested.' It was illegal for a picket to try to persaude a scab to join his fellow-workers, but perfectly legal for an employee of the shop to run out and ask two girls who were passing by to come in and work as scabs.

"All the time the picket line continued its slow march up and down the sidewalk. Passing automobiles, trucks, milk-wagons, delivery boys all stopped to read the signs, and gaze at the increasing line of pickets. When the number had been considerably augmented someone started singing the song beloved of all unions, 'Solidarity Forever.' In a minute the whole line had taken up the refrain and the street echoed with the shouts of stirring words and music. At the end of two hours the order was given to leave. Then to the swing of the 'Marseillaise' and 'Hold the Fort For We Are Coming,' all the pickets, two by two, walked the mile back to the union office, through the center of Paterson and along its busiest streets. The students still wore the armor of their belief, the brightly colored placards. Automobiles crept along at ten miles, so that the drivers could read the signs, bus-drivers endangered the lives of their passengers by looking at the slogans instead of the traffic signals, store-windows and doorways were filled with curious clerks and proprietors, and even the busiest passerby slowed down to see 'what all the fuss was about.' Paterson, like it or not, was forced to notice a strike for the 'American standard of living' within its midst."

These striking workers had been goaded on to action by conditions that since 1924 have steadily become worse. At that time, as the students discovered, skilled workers were receiving a wage of $32 a week, which is considerably below the annual $2,000 minimum wage considered by the Department of Labor as essential to the average family of five. At the time of the strike these workers received $28 weekly, while the unskilled earned much less. Since the incident mentioned above some of the strikers have gone back to work in those shops that granted their demands of an eight-hour day, a minimum wage and recognition of the union.

After Graduation

EMPHASIS in the college is coming to be placed more and more on preparation of the student for some little niche in the huge and intricate business world. The little pamphlet received by seniors at Columbia College the other day is a sign of the times. It bears the imprint of the University and is apparently sent out for the purpose of preparing the students for their place in the business world. The title is "How to Get and Keep a Job," and the author is Mr. C. R. Dooley of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey. The young man, Mr. Dooley says, must work hard, be docile, must possess "a great deal of fighting ability" and "some of the characteristics of the politician." He must throw aside any Aristotelian nonsense about material goods as means for the Good Life and must accept Babbitt's philosophy of money-making as an end in itself. He will, with Mr. Dooley, look with scorn upon the "pathetic spectacle" of those who "seek a job and nothing more; it matters not to them what kind of a job it is, so long as it does not require many hours and provides a reasonable income."

Conscription and Rebellion

LEST we forget that not only Bolivia and Paraguay are busy at war preparations, the University of Washington has disclosed that it will drop thirty-two men at the end of the quarter because of failure to attend classes in compulsory military training. The action was reported to have been taken at the request of the local R. O. T. C. unit. It clearly demonstrates how our universities are no longer masters in their own homes, for the local military unit in turn takes *its* orders from the War Department at Washington, D. C. The students had become too defiant for the military men, and that is why this drastic measure was insisted upon. From time to time, ever since the War, undergraduate demonstrations have been staged against peace-time conscription. If the University thinks that it it has put an end to these rumblings of discontent, it is mistaken. Student indignation will not down so easily.

The Professor's Wage

ONE OF the unfortunate results of low professorial salaries is that they force many faculty members to work at extra-academic jobs in order to gain a livelihood. Sometimes this work is "unusually poorly paid," and frequently of a "tedious and otherwise unpleasant" character. It often interferes with scholastic work in which every professor ought to be engaged in order to keep from growing intellectually stale. These are the conclusions of the committee on the academic standard of living appointed by the Yale University chapter of the American Association of University Professors.

"There is reason to believe," the chapter announced, at the outset of the investigation, "that the economic conditions of the professors are such as effectively to discourage many young men of high quality of intellect and force of character from adopting this profession." The conclusions reached after a thorough study of conditions at Yale corroborated this fear. It was found that "the present scale of salaries affords good conditions for a scholarly life for an unmarried man; but a distinctly meager existence in all grades for a man and wife with no children. For a family including three or four children between fifteen and twenty-four years of age, that is, the family of a full professor fifty years of age with twenty-five years of service behind him, the salaries afford a wage which falls considerably short of supporting a scale of living comparable to that of fairly successful men in other professions." If a professor receives the minimum pay of his rank, his salary is about one-third of such an imaginary scale. And the Yale wages are said to be no lower than elsewhere.

Those Boston Police

POLICE interference with student activities at Harvard has become a habit. Several years ago they censored the *Lampoon*, and this year they have gone in for dramatic criticism. "Fiesta," Michael Gold's drama of life among the lowly Mexican peons which the Harvard Dramatic Club produced at a great expense this year, was barred from Boston following an unfavorable report upon its first showing in Cambridge. The police found some obscene lines in the play, according to their report to Mayor Nichols.

Reviewer's Copy

Orlando Tedioso

By NEWTON ARVIN

TUCKED away in some obscure corner of a daily paper—a daily paper of which the first page was bedizened with accounts of good-will visits and royal medical bulletins—I recently came upon a piece of news that struck me as at once more momentous and more alarming than any of these fugitive affairs. I have forgotten, I am sorry to say, all the details and all the figures given; but the essential fact I remember very clearly. It was that some diligent scientist somewhere had been engaged in re-estimating the total weight of the earth—a thing, I gathered, that had not been done carefully for perhaps a dozen years—and that, according to his results, our planet had become very considerably heavier in the interval. No doubt he had been prepared for just such a conclusion; no doubt Macaulay's "every schoolboy" knows that this believing world is gaining weight in proportion as it loses heat; but the fact, I confess, was news to me, and I have not yet been able to drive from my mind the oppressive sense of those thousands of tons—rather of fat, I suppose, than of muscle—that have been taken on, in so short a space, by the planet of which we are inhabitants. The image summons up a thousand reflections, and all of them are dismal; but I allude to it here only because I have speculated whether there might be some occult connection between this general telluric movement toward overweight and the indescribable heaviness which seems to make *Orlando*[1], as compared with Virginia Woolf's previous books, a pretentious failure. "Heavy" is a hard word, and it is the last word one would have expected ever to associate with a book by Virginia Woolf; but somehow it forces itself upon one's mind as one finishes *Orlando*. Can it be that literature, like the earth, is measurably cooling off, and measurably gaining "unhealthy" weight?

All joking aside, it is certainly curious that a writer ordinarily so tactful, so discriminating, so cunning in the evocation of intangibilities, should so definitely fail to incite the imagination as Virginia Woolf does in this very much over-praised "biography." Granted that the idea was an inspiration; granted that *Orlando* has many delightful pages; the fact remains that it does not really come off, and that one feels, in reading it, that odd sympathetic embarrassment which comes over one on watching a vaudeville performer who fumbles his most difficult stunt. Yet of course the "bad plays" of genuinely distinguished writers are always engaging problems for the critic, and the relative failure of *Orlando* as an experiment in ironic fantasy gives one an opportunity to consider how Virginia Woolf's real powers are to be described. Only once before has Mrs. Woolf written so unsatisfactory a book, and that was in a very different vein. *Night and Day*, her second novel, though it had one unforgettable character—the freakish Mrs. Hilbery—was an extraordinarily uninteresting book; and that because the subject itself and the whole manner were plainly uncongenial to the author. A study, more or less in the Jane Austen tradition, of the matrimonial problems of a group of four young people, *Night and Day* demanded of Mrs. Woolf an attention to dramatic conflict, to situation, to closely interwoven motives, which is the stock in trade of the average competent novelist, but no part of her special genius; and one can easily see why it became twice as long as it should be, and why Mrs. Woolf, in her bored indifference to the task, forgot the original name of one of the characters.

Over against that single previous fiasco are to be set those four consummate books, *The Voyage Out*, *Jacob's Room*, *Mrs. Dalloway*, and To *the Lighthouse*. Over against the sluggish flow of *Night and Day*, the bright, swift, beautiful movement of Rachel Vinrace's introduction to the joy and terror of human experience, of Jacob Flanders' short but happy career, of Clarissa Dalloway's day-full of perceptions and adventures, of the Ramsay family's dissensions and discoveries. What reader of these books has failed to feel the delicate yet substantial and even dense quality of the imagination that produced them? What reader has failed to see that they are the happy and congenial expressions of a rich literary temperament, incommensurable in their imaginative effect? Their peculiar "note" may be difficult to define, but its presence is unmistakable. Not the detached and patterned conflict of the psychological novel, not the broad and crowded canvas of the novel of manners, not the extrinsic bustle and confusion of the romance; but the complicated unity-in-disunity of experience itself, the *effect* of life rather the facts of life, and the emergence of timelessness out of time—these are the conditions of Virginia Woolf's fiction, and the basis for describing her powers. With these four books in mind, one would say that she was most at home in a world such as that in which poets move—a world full of secret and delightful analogies, where all things may become significant of all other things, and where pain and joy are intricately but not meaninglessly entangled. *Mrs. Dalloway* and the others are in this sense serious books: their appeal is to one's feeling for the whole of reality as distinguished from special aspects of it, and they live on in one's imagination with singular toughness and rotundity, for all their apparent tenuity. Mrs. Woolf is the last writer whom one would expect to write a successful fairy tale.

The fairy tale is hardly the class to which *Orlando* belongs, yet the book has closer affinities with *Alice in Wonderland* or *Penguin Island* than with serious poetry. It is, as I have said, an experiment in ironic fantasy; and if it does nothing else, it demonstrates that Mrs. Woolf can-

[1]ORLANDO, A Biography. Virginia Woolf. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. 1928. $3.00.

not put her heart into any such task. Everyone, I suppose, knows by this time what the book is "about." Everyone has heard that Orlando, at the beginning of the book, is a young Elizabethan nobleman with an unconfessed passion for writing poetry, who takes the fancy of Elizabeth herself on a royal visit she pays to his father's country-house, and who becomes one of her favorites at the court. As a young man with many intrinsic and circumstantial attractions, Orlando has numerous "affairs" of both an official and an unofficial nature; but none that quite stirs him to his depths until he falls in love with the daughter of the Russian Ambassador, the strangely seductive Sasha. For a time Orlando is on the crest of the wave, but his naive confidence in Sasha's unique purity and devotion is at length destroyed; and, cursing his own credulity, he gives over all interest in the sex. Later he is still more rudely disillusioned, in his hero-worshiping attitude toward men of letters, by the scurvy treatment he receives at the hands of the poet Nick Greene, whom he has entertained and befriended. A Roumanian Archduchess crosses his path, but by this time the seventeenth century, unaccountably enough, is more than half spent; and Orlando, still in the flower of his youth, is sent as Ambassador to Turkey by Charles II. Here he has a taste of the elegant fatigues of diplomacy, but what makes his stay in Constantinople really memorable is his abrupt transformation, after having been made a Duke, into a woman—and a Duchess. Escaping from the Turkish court, Orlando spends some time among the gypsies, but their fine wild life is not for her; and gradually she makes her way back to England, where the eighteenth century rapidly slips by her—torn as she frequently is between her new femininity and recrudescences of manhood—to land her in the middle of the nineteenth century with a growing sense of the necessity of getting a husband. How she succeeds in getting one, and how, in the third decade of the twentieth century, she at last becomes a mother, is revealed in the two final chapters; but the story can hardly be outlined here.

As I have thus inadequately summarized it, *Orlando* would appear to have at least the merit of inventiveness; and certainly it is impossible not to be diverted as well by the leading conception as by a score of episodes and details. Indeed, what strikes one as most extraordinary is that a book based on so ingenious a scheme, and enlivened with so many incidental sallies of fancy, should lie, as a whole, so heavily upon the imagination. One can see at a glance to how many amusing purposes the scheme should lend itself. For one thing, of course, it gives Mrs. Woolf an opportunity to parody, at one point or another, the manner of the solemn biographer; and this she does, not only indirectly, but by explicit references to the difficulties or the delicacies of her biographical task. From another point of view the book should have been a success if only because of the amusement latent in the notion of one person's living in periods so different in style as the Elizabethan and our own, as well as in both the Age of Pope and the Age of Tennyson; and in fact Mrs. Woolf extracts considerable humor from her transitions and temporal cross-references, especially at the point where the nineteenth century, like a great black cloud, settles down over the airy England of the Enlightenment. "With the twelfth stroke of midnight, the darkness was complete. A turbulent welter of cloud covered the city. All was dark; all was doubt; all was confusion. The eighteenth century was over; the nineteenth century had begun. Perhaps it is not too fanciful to read into Orlando's change of sex, and temporary vacillation between the two, a meaning germane to this—a parable of the robust masculinity of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, of the somewhat epicene status of the England of Lord Chesterfield and Mrs. Carter, of the unrelieved womanishness of English life under Victoria. In any event, a third aspect of the joke is certainly involved in the change of sex, and the chance it affords Mrs. Woolf to satirize the traditional male attitude toward women. This she does with a pleasant malice, and of course with a dash of novelty.

It is easy enough to see that *Orlando* has these "points," and even two or three others; but no possible enumeration of them can save the book from its general effect of laboriousness, diffuseness, and—the fact cannot be dodged—inanity. It is noteworthy, for instance, that the prose itself is, for Mrs. Woolf, conventional and perfunctory; and when one thinks of the style of *Mrs. Dalloway* — so supple, so vibrant, so full of a strange animation—one feels sure that something went wrong at the outset in the composition of *Orlando*. But it is not chiefly a matter of style; it is much more important that one never gets genuinely interested in Orlando himself—or herself; I do not mean, in the usual serious sense, but in the sense in which one does get interested in Alice or, on another level, in the Knight of the Woeful Countenance. There is just too much of what is soberly true in Orlando's makeup—too much of what is "real" without metaphor or distortion—for one to accept the fantastic rhythms of his (her) career; the unreality that should be the effect, is not the genuine article. The book, indeed, vacillates between one sort of effect and another; there is far too much shifting of gears; and as a result, where we look for exuberance, drive, and precision, we get a heavily-breathing patchiness. How can one feel that such a passage as this argues anything but impatience with the whole business?—"It was now November. After November, comes December. Then January, February, March, and April. After April comes May. June, July, August follow. Next is September. Then October, and so, behold, here we are back at November again, with a whole year accomplished." Perhaps the joke is on the reader, but this, as humor, seems to me to be feeble orchestration.

If *Orlando*, then, is a failure, what does it tell us about Virginia Woolf? Simply, it seems to me, that she has not the kind of imagination that turns naturally toward fantasy as a means of expression, not the kind of imagination that really takes pleasure in a calculated improbability. For the writing of an *Alice in Wonderland* one needs a certain spontaneous irresponsibility: "inventiveness" is the *sine qua non;* and Mrs. Woolf's imagination is neither irresponsible nor merely inventive. After all, could anything be farther from the fanciful than the substance of *Jacob's Room* or *To the Lighthouse*? Could anything be closer to the warm current of experience itself, or truer to the recognizable cadences of reality? That, one may be sure, is what genuinely enlists Mrs. Woolf's loyalty; and material more abstract, more purely whimsical or witty, would, one might have predicted, be almost certain to bore or repel her. Bored she must have been with the adventures of the good Orlando, or she could not have written so lamely; and in consequence, the book is, at the very best, a *tour de force* somewhat more readable, for its author's sake, than the average competent novel. Happily, Mrs. Woolf, like Iago, is "nothing if not critical"; and hence is not at all likely to repeat this particular mistake.

A Valiant Crusader

IN the midst of an era of the cynical and the blasé, the story of Susan B. Anthony makes one yearn to be swept again by the gallant spirit that runs high whenever great leaders animate a people. Susan B. Anthony was a great leader, a keen thinker, a tireless worker. And thanks to the skill of her biographer, Mrs. Rheta Childe Dorr, not only a real person but a whole turbulent period moves with vivid color across the pages of this fascinating book.

To the young American of today it is a little startling to look back on the status of women a short hundred years ago. Under the English Common Law, which obtained in America as in England, women were considered perpetual minors. They were under male guardianship until twenty-one; unmarried women of all ages must have male trustees of their property; married women were unable to own property at all, or even to exercise legal guardianship of their own children. Legally and politically, indeed, women were grouped with children, criminals and the insane. Though remnants of such abuses still persist (as witnessed recently by the decision of American customs-officials that Mme. Ganna Walska, a resident of France, is legally a resident of the United States because her husband lives here) yet the status of women has undergone a revolutionary change, and their right to consideration as free individuals has been legally acknowledged in most major respects.

It is not strange that Susan Anthony emerges with heroic dimensions from her battle with the old attitude, shared by women as well as men. For it took all the clear thinking, inexhaustible energy, and daring courage of a great person to keep the issue clear in a time when the Puritan tradition, weighted with sex taboos, could be depended on to inflame the passions and blur the thinking of the average man or woman.

Susan B. Anthony[1] was born in 1820 of Quaker parents, and educated at Deborah Moulson's Select Seminary for Females. The studies, mainly in "the Principles of Morality, Humility and the Love of Virtue," Susan's vigorous intellect found unstimulating, and it was not without difficulty that she remained compliant with the arduous notions of virtue entertained by the highly moral Miss Moulson. When her father's fortune suffered reverses she was not unhappy to become a wage earner, replacing, at two dollars and fifty cents a week, a man who, for the same position, had received a wage of ten dollars.

Wherever she taught, Susan soon became a local celebrity, and the "smartest woman in Canajoharie" rejected numerous offers of marriage, enjoyed diversions, pretty clothes and gaiety with complete enthusiasm. She read avidly, was interested in political questions, particularly abolition and temperance, and even at this time rebelled against the standards of conduct for women. Genteel ladies, themselves very slightly if at all acquainted with Yankee alcohol, were in the habit of accepting without protest the attentions of inebriated swains. The code outraged Susan's sense of decency, and her interest in temperance was for a long time her chief preoccupation. Indeed, it was not until she had seen women delegates unseated at temperance conventions, and herself had been ignored and insulted while working for that cause, that her somewhat tepid interest in women's rights was finally converted into the passionate conviction to which she dedicated her life.

From 1853 until the day of her death, the story of that life is one of faithful and devoted labor for the rights of women. The idea of women's independence, until 1848, had been thought and talked about by a few widely scattered people. Then Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott, together with an ardent band of co-workers, went into action. Five years later they were joined by Susan Anthony, whose role of follower gradually changed into that of the most active leader of them all. They were called atheists and hermaphrodites, but bravely they carried on, made house to house canvasses, wrote, lectured, held conventions, and sent petitions signed with hundreds of thousands of names to state and federal legislators. Time after time the "protectors of women's interests" denounced, derided or ignored them; undismayed they continued their fight for a cause which none of them lived to see victorious. Yet they did live to see important modifications in the laws governing the status of their sex; and they also lived to see their movement "viewed first with astonishment and alarm, then with ridicule and abuse, finally with respect and homage."

Mrs. Dorr's is an eloquent pen. She has the gift of gentle irony and vibrant enthusiasm, and her humor is sly and irresistible. Here and there, however, her sympathy with Susan's fundamentally radical point of view clashes strangely with jingoistic references to the late World War. One is reluctantly forced to wonder if Mrs. Dorr is one of those for whom only dead heroes are good heroes; one of those able to champion freedom for all only when none of their favorite credos is assailed. It was Susan Anthony who unwittingly voiced the dilemma of every radical during every great war when she wrote, "I have tried to persuade myself that I alone remained mad while all the rest had become sane, because I have insisted that it is our bounden duty to bear not only our usual testimony but one even louder and more earnest than ever before. . . ." Mrs. Dorr quotes this statement with evident approval. It is a little strange, therefore, that she appears so blind to its implications. This inconsistency is a disturbing element which mars an otherwise excellent piece of work.

Sylvia Feningston.

---

[1]SUSAN B. ANTHONY. Rheta Childe Dorr. Frederick A. Stokes Company. $5.00.

In the Living Tissue

THE battery of criticism that is constantly hammering away at contemporary college education has for its ammunition several general reforms that have been adopted with varying degrees of completeness by our more progressive institutions. The most important of them are: more student self-direction; a reconstruction of the curriculum in such a way that knowledge is presented in some organic connection rather than in isolated "departments"; democracy in administration and better teaching. With the exception of one original proposal, Dean McConn's book[1] is little more than a re-statement of these theses which have been nailed to the door of the American college. If there are differences they are of emphasis rather than basic principle.

More such books will be written in coming years. Discussion will center upon whether we ought to turn the freshmen loose in Greek civilization or take them on a good-will tour of the arts and sciences, and other matters of like weight. With respect to this particular controversy, I would say that both methods are equally good or equally bad, depending on the way they are done. Being one of those rare believers in educational reform, who has had the peculiar fortune of trying out his medicine upon himself, the writer can say that he has used both methods, with equal success. As for the other reforms, there may or may not be more than one way of carrying them out. Those battles are of little interest to the layman. For him it is sufficient to know that the fights waged in behalf of certain principles have been won and we have entered upon the phase of wearisome discussion as to the precise method for realizing them—to say nothing of the not-too-easy job of finding colleges willing to carry them out.

There are other issues, however,—fundamental ones—that these measures do not touch. Dean McConn raises one of them in his book and disposes of it in a way that invites further debate. I refer to the question of what relation the college ought to bear to the social scheme as a whole and its responsibilities in that direction. Dean McConn has demonstrated that it is possible to embrace all the above-mentioned measures and still cling to a traditional and highly questionable point of view as to the whole purpose of the college as an instrument of society.

Because the colleges have become playgrounds for the children from leisure-class families, and because intellectual standards set by these idlers generally prevail—standards by which C is a "gentleman's grade" and anyone unashamedly interested in learning is branded as a "greasy grind"—the Dean has been forced to declare himself in a peculiar way on the relation of college to the outside world. He advocates a dual college system: a Gentleman's College where idlers may idle, and a Real College for the serious-minded. The faculty, he says, is continually complaining of the demoralizing effect of this dilettante class upon the other students, but the professors do not understand "the real purposes and needs of the super-kindergarten group." If these gay young people want a different type of education "and are willing to pay for . . . what they cannot at present get satisfactorily in any college in America" then let us build the sort of college that will please them. "Such a college should, of course, announce its special purpose to the world with entire honesty. It should proclaim in its catalogues and other literature, that it is not the purpose of this college to turn out musty pedants or visionary (and potentially dangerous) intellectuals, but to prepare normal young men for positions of leadership in the American social and business world." This Gentleman's College "could within ten years attain an enviable primacy of social repute among all our institutions, and realize its wildest dreams as to students and funds. And its success would be deserved, for it would be, for the first time, doing superbly one of the three jobs which the American community demands of the college."

What the American community demands of the college! This criterion for education will lead to conclusions that the Dean may not wish to endorse. The proposal for schools of this sort has often been made in jest, but this is the first time it has been taken seriously.

It will be recalled that a rather vociferous section of the American community has been demanding that education be in accord with the cosmogony of Genesis. Why not build colleges for their children, too?

But in spite of a few chapters devoted to this particular version of the college's responsibility to the community, one feels that the complex inter-relations between college and society are not very important to Dean McConn in his role of educational reformer. He will not grant, for instance, that business, to a marked degree, molds our higher education. He writes as if the college were a free agent, touching the world only to transform it, not to be transformed in turn. Educational reform is for him mainly a matter of changing methods within the college irrespective of these exterior forces. It is significant that when, in the first chapter, he speculates on what light the scientists may throw upon the troubled waters of higher education, he concludes that the psychologists of the future may be helpful in reforming education. Why only the psychologists? Has the educational theorist no use for scientists who study the effect of mores and prevailing vested interests upon education? There are, I venture, few diagnoses more penetrating and useful for an understanding of this subject than Veblen's study of how religious and industrial interests have turned college education to their respective uses, in *Higher Learning in America*. Yet Dean McConn classifies Veblen with that sentimental and highly melodramatic critic of education, Upton Sinclair, and dismisses him as a lurid alarmist. "Trustees and presidents are so selected and empowered that they *might be* the heavy villains of the academic tragedy; but in reality, they aren't", the Dean concludes. Although the reviewer could point to many cases of just such heavy villains as the Dean does not believe exist, he agrees that radical critics usually overestimate their influence. But the point is that there actually are few if any villains in Veblen's book; there are dominating social trends which determine men and institutions in a particular way. But the men who give the money for education are ordinary men, and neither bloodthirsty capitalists nor benevolent angels, as the sentimentalists on both sides look upon them.

Happily, there are some recent studies that attempt to see the college as in itself it really is; of which, however, space permits no more than a mere mention. At last, someone has taken the trouble to find out what social classes are sending their children to college. *The Social and Economic Status of College Students*[1] gives statistics gathered from fifty-five representative colleges, on parental occupations, incomes, the extent of self-support among college students and other invaluable facts. *The Campus*[2] is a careful study, made at the University of Michigan, of undergraduate life. It is done with an eye to the total environment, both inside and out of the institution.

The fourth book[3] is concerned with the public schools, and is mentioned because the author has succeeded in

---

[1]COLLEGE OR KINDERGARTEN? Max McConn. New Republic, Inc. $1.00.

[1]THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE COLLEGE STUDENT. O. E. Reynolds, Ph. D. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University. $1.50.

[2]THE CAMPUS. Robert Cooley Angell. Appleton. $2.50.

[3]SCHOOL AND SOCIETY IN CHICAGO. George S. Counts. Harcourt, Brace. $2.50.

Organizations • Periodicals • Schools

ORGANIZATIONS

FREE SPEECH IN ALL ITS PHASES
Write
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
100 Fifth Avenue, New York City

COMMITTEE ON MILITARISM IN EDUCATION—Opposes military training by the War Department in civilian colleges, including compulsory training, and training in high schools. Literature sent on request. Address 387 Bible House, Astor Place, New York City.

LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY—Promotes a better understanding of problems of democracy in industry through its pamphlet, research and lecture services and organization of college and city groups. Executive Directors, Harry W. Laidler and Norman Thomas, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

THE YOUTH SECTION OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION is a group of young men and women, who, believing in the oneness of the human family seek to express the principles of Jesus in regard to War, Race, Industry and other human relationships. For Literature write: Youth Section, F. O. R.

PREVENTION OF WAR LITERATURE—Apply to the National Council for Prevention of War, 532 17th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

ETHICAL SOCIETIES. PUBLIC SUNDAY MEETINGS AT 11 A. M., with Live Addresses on Moral Issues of the Day. No dogma; no religious test for fellowship. Boston. Repertory Hall. Brooklyn: Academy of Music. Chicago: Studebaker Theatre. New York: Meeting House, Central Park West and 64th Street. Philadelphia: Academy of Music. St. ouis: Sheldon Memorial, 3648 Washington Boulevard. Students specially welcome. GIVE YOUR LIFE A MORAL PURPOSE! Information and specimen of our magazine, THE STANDARD, from American Ethical Union, 2 W. 64th Street, New York.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION LEAGUE—311 South Juniper Street, Philadelphia, furnishes information and speakers on "P. R.", the new method of election used in Cleveland, Cincinnati, Ireland, etc., which is designed to make popular government a reality.

photographing a living segment of education as it is going on in society. Those who have read scattered newspaper accounts of Mayor Thompson's running feud with Superintendent McAndrews of the Chicago schools will be surprised to find that these events are but the most spectacular parts of a complex situation in which many tangled interests are involved. "The analysis of the Chicago school situation presented in this volume," writes Professor Counts

> "partial and inadequate as it is, reveals a picture of bewildering complexity. It shows the system of education, not as an adventitious growth on the body politic, but as part and parcel of the living tissue of society. What affects the one cannot leave the other unchanged. The daily search for bread and security, for love and adventure and companions, that perpetually absorbs the energies of men and women; the selfish struggle for power and privilege that constantly engrosses the attention of individuals and groups; the violent storms of passion that occasionally sweep through the social order; the wild irrational moods that sometimes seize on the minds of the masses; the enlightened movements for civic reform that now and then catch the popular imagination; the bitter clashes of sect and class, of race and occupation, that inevitably attend the evolution of institutions—in a word, every vibration that agitates the social structure must sooner or later reach the public school."

The college does not respond so immediately to these forces as does the public school—and some of them pass it by completely—but respond it does to the society of which it is a part. And it is high time that our educational theorizers recognized these subtle and elusive interconnections.

Norman Studer.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM—U. S. Headquarters, 522 17th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. An International Organization with 25 National Sections pursuing a common program to end war through world organization for social, political and economic cooperation. International President, Jane Addams; National Chairman, Hannah Clothier Hull; Executive Secretary, Dorothy Detzer.

YOUNG POALE ZION, 32 Union Square, N. Y. C., organizes the liberal elements in American Jewish Youth on behalf of pro-labor policies and creates a sympathetic understanding in America for the Jewish nationalist socialist movement in Palestine. Official publication, "YUGNT."

NATIONAL CHILD LABOR COMMITTEE—Improves child labor legislation; conducts investigation in local communities; advises on administration; furnishes information. Supplies leaflets, posters and plays for free distribution and reasonably priced pamphlets on various aspects of child labor. 215 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

WORKERS' EDUCATION BUREAU OF AMERICA—A cooperative EDUCATIONAL AGENCY for the promotion of ADULT EDUCATION among INDUSTRIAL WORKERS, 476 West 24th Street, New York City. Spencer Miller, Jr., Sec'y.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, a nation-wide, nonpartisan organization for arousing in American citizens an intelligent and influential interest in their government. New Voters' Units in colleges and normal schools. New York office: 821 Graybar Building, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

THE AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE (Quakers)—special fields: International, Interracial, Peace, Patriotic Service. Address the Secretary, 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

THE WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE unites all men and women, regardless of their social, religious or political beliefs, who have determined to give no support to any war. We are circulating the American Peace Letter, modeled on the Peace Letter to th Prime Minister of Arthur Ponsonby, M. P., which received over 128.000 signatures in Great Britain. Write for information to The War Resisters League, 171 West 12th Street, New York City. Jessie Wallace Hughan, Secretary.

PERIODICALS

THE NATION—A weekly review of significant news. Prints more college news than any other political weekly. Contains distinguished literary reviews and dramatic criticism. $5.00 per year. $2.50 for six months. Special class rates on request. 20 Vesey Street, New York.

LABOR AGE, The National Monthly, presents the answer to the challenge of Reaction, and stimulates the workers to fight against the fraud and fakery of the Newer Capitalism. Trial 6-monthly subscription, $1. 3 West 16th Street, New York City.

NEW MASSES—Editor—Michael Gold. A radical monthly of art and literature. Published by a group of some of the most brilliant writers and artists in America. One of its purposes is to reveal the talented work of unknown young writers and artists. $1.50 a year: special trial subscription rate to students $1.00 for seven months. 39 Union Square, New York City.

THE INTERCOLLEGIAN
347 Madison Avenue, New York

News, Reviews, Articles, Forums on matters of concern to the Student Christian Movement. Monthly, October to June. Single subscriptions, 1.25; in clubs of five, $1.

THE DAILY WORKER, the only fighting daily labor paper in America. Read about our campaign against injunctions—unemployment—company unions—persecution of the foreign born—the new World War in the making and the campaigns for organization of the unorganized. Recognition and Defense of the Soviet Union—Miners' Relief and a Labor Party. Three months trial subscription $2.00. 26-28 Union Square, New York City.

SCHOOLS

THE MODERN SCHOOL
STELTON, N. J.

A Co-educational School for Children where the Key-note of Learning is the Freedom of Self-Expression in Creative Activities with a Social Environment Developing Responsibility and Comradeship. Boarding Dept.
Write for Catalogue. Jas. H. Dick, Prin.

THE NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

announces evening courses by

FIVE AUTHORITIES OF WORLD-WIDE DISTINCTION

beginning the first week of January

Italy from 1860 to 1922:
An Experiment in Democracy.... *G. Salvemini*
Twelve lectures—Mondays

***Present Day Political Movements in Europe .....** *H. N. Brailsford*
Six lectures—Wednesdays

****Northern Exploration....** *Vilhjalmur Stefansson*
Twelve lectures—Wednesdays

The Criminal and Human Nature... *Fritz Wittels*
Ten lectures—Fridays, beginning Jan. 11

Art and the Actual ..... *Leo Stein*
Twelve lectures—Fridays
(Fee, $20)

FEE FOR TWELVE LECTURES, $15; FOR TEN LECTURES, $12; *FEE, $7; **TO BE GIVEN AT RUMFORD HALL (50 E. 41)

465 West 23rd Street **New York City**

The MODERN QUARTERLY

Celebrating the Beginning of its Fifth Year
ADDRESSES
A New Challenge to American and European Culture In Its Current Issue
EDWARD J. O'BRIEN
In His Article on
THE AMERICAN SHORT STORY
has written a most remarkable and incisive attack upon the American short story and American life.

Other Articles in the Issue:
REVOLT AND REACTION IN CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.....V. F. Calverton
WOMAN AND CULTURE
Alexander Goldenweiser
WHITHER TROTSKY.....Louis Fischer
A PSYCHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF SOCIALISM.....Samuel D. Schmalhausen
ART AND MARXISM.....N. Lunacharsky
THE BANKRUPTCY OF SEX TABOO
Harry Elmer Barnes

With a Spirited Controversy over Modern Marxism
MAX EASTMAN versus SIDNEY HOOK
Subscribe now to the Only Cultural Magazine of Revolutionary Character in the U. S.

THE MODERN QUARTERLY
P. O. BOX 322, Baltimore, Maryland.
I enclose—**$1.50**—subscription for one year to The Modern Quarterly.
$3.00—subscription for one year to The Modern Quarterly and copy of V. F. Calverton's BANKRUPTCY OF MARRIAGE or S. D. Schmalhausen's WHY WE MISBEHAVE.
$2.00—Modern Quarterly and The New Student each for one year.
50c for single copy.

NAME.....
ADDRESS.....
CITY.....STATE.....

Praise from the Professors

"I am enclosing my check for a year's subscription to *The New Student*, with my enthusiastic congratulations on the robust and prosperous appearance of the magazine. What you have done with it, the character of the contributors and the nature of the contributions, all seems to me, having known the paper in its slender beginnings, quite marvellous. You are evidently on the way toward making it one of our most important monthlies. If you can do this without sacrificing your contact with the colleges, there are few college presidents to touch you as an educational leader."—*E. S. B.*

"I am pleased to know that *The New Student* has undertaken a project I have long felt desirable in college life. I enclose my subscription herewith, and have marked three articles which I as a professor of English should like to have."—*E. E. L.*

"You are to be congratulated on the type of thing you are doing with your publication, and I shall take pleasure in calling attention to your paper on the part of my teacher colleagues."—*J. W. H.*

If you are a professor and like THE NEW STUDENT, why not recommend it to your classes? Or else send for a bundle order of some issue that has an article pertaining to the subject you teach. Write for our special price for bundle orders, and our reduced subscription rate to classes, student clubs, etc.

Please send *The New Student to*

Name .....

Address .....

THE NEW STUDENT
2929 BROADWAY NEW YORK CITY
One dollar a year

THE ARBITRATOR claims that Norman Thomas received only 300,000 votes because he is not teratogenetic. If you are, you will enjoy this monthly summary of liberal views and news. Sixty cents a year. 114 East 31st Street, New York City.